Encyclopaedia of Indian War of Independence

Vol. 3

Contents

1

LALA LAJPAT RAI

Lala Lajpat Rai was an Indian author and politician who is chiefly remembered as a leader in the Indian fight for freedom from the British Raj. The freedom fighter was popularly known as *Punjab Kesari* (Lion of the Punjab). He was also the founder Punjab National Bank and Lakshmi Insurance Company.

EARLY LIFE

Rai was born on January 28, 1865 in village Dhudi Ke, in present day Moga district of Punjab, India. He was the eldest son of Munshi Radha Kishan Azad and Gulab Devi, Aggarwal Banias. His father had a chequered relationship with Hinduism - having converted to Islam and then reverted back to Hinduism, which had a lasting effect on Rai's attitude towards religions other than Hinduism. He spent much of his youth in Jagraon, district Ludhiana, Punjab. His house still stands tall in Jagraon and houses a Library and museum.

POLITICAL CAREER

He was one of the three most prominent Hindu Nationalist members of the Indian National Congress, who fought for, and gave their lives during the Indian independence movement in the first half of the twentieth century. The other two were Bal Gangadhar Tilak of Maharashtra and Bipin Chandra Pal of Bengal. Collectively, they were dubbed *Lal-Bal-Pal*, and formed the extremist Hindu faction of the Indian National Congress, as opposed to the moderate faction led first by Gopal Krishna Gokhale and later by Mahatma Gandhi. Rai was also a member of the Hindu Maha Sabha, a forerunner of the current day Hindu

nationalist party, the Bharatiya Janata Party. It was the Partition of Bengal in 1905 that aroused their robust nationalism and set them firmly on the path to fighting for freedom. The repressive measures of the British Government against the growing nationalist movement inspired them to infuse greater national pride and self-respect into the populace. The trio wanted a degree of self-government that was considered radical at the time. They were the first Indian leaders to demand complete political independence. Rai presided over the first session of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1920. He also went to Geneva to attend the eighth International Labour Conference in 1926 as a representative of Indian labour. He had an opportunity to watch the labour movement in the USA and England where he was required to prolong his stay for political reasons.

Rai led the Punjab protests against the Amritsar Massacre (1919) and the Non-Cooperation Movement (1919 - 1922). He was repeatedly arrested. Rai however disagreed with Mohandas Gandhi's suspension of the movement due to the Chauri Chaura incident, and formed the *Congress Independence Party*, which was particularly pro-Hindu in voice and policy. He was not only a good orator but also a prolific and versatile writer. His journal *Arya Gazette* concentrated mainly on subjects related to the Arya Samaj. *Bande Mataram* and *People*, contained his inspiring speeches to end oppression by the foreign rulers. He founded the Servants of the People Society, which worked for the freedom movement as well as for social reform in the country. He also wrote an autobiography in English titled *The Story of My Life*.

SIMON COMMISSION PROTESTS

A strong believer in leading by example, he himself led a procession with Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to demonstrate against the Simon Commission, which was to prove fatal for him. He was made the target of a brutal lathi charge in which he was injured badly. A meeting was held the same evening where he spoke with such vigour that his words, *"Every blow aimed at me is a nail in the coffin of British imperialism"*, became historic. Though he recovered from the fever and pain within three days his health had received a permanent setback and on November 17, 1928, he succumbed to the fatal injuries.

AUTHOR

Lala Lajpat Rai wrote extensively, among them - Josiah Wedgwood - The Man And His Work, The United States of America: A Hindu's impressions and a study, History of the Arya Samaj, Swaraj and social change, England's Debt to India: A historical narrative of Britain's fiscal policy in India, The Problems Of National Education In India and Unhappy India: Being a reply to Katherine Mayo's "Mother India", published in 1928. (Mother India was a polemical account of India's self rule by American historian Katherine Mayo.)

INSPIRATION AND MEMORIAL

Lajpat Rai was one of the most important nationalist leaders from the Punjab, where he is remembered reverently by Hindu nationalists today. He was a key mentor of nationalists like Bhagat Singh and Chandrasekhar Azad.

The Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial Trust was formed in 1959 on the eve of his Centenary Birth Celebration, to promote education - a cause very dear to his heart. The trust was founded by a group of Punjabi philanthropists (including R.P Gupta and B.M Grover) who have settled and prospered in the Indian State of Maharashtra.

Lajpat Nagar and Lajpat Nagar Central Market in New Delhi, Lala Lajpat Rai Hall of Residence at Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) in Kharagpur and Lala Lajpat Rai Institute of Engineering and Technology, Moga are named in his honor. Also many institutes, Schools and Library in his hometown of Jagraon, district Ludhiana are named after him.

SAGA OF SUFFERING AND NATIONAL RESURGENCE

The life story of Lala Lajpat Rai reads like an epic. Not only he lived a hero's life but his death too was crowned with the halo of a martyr. He shot into fame as one of the triumvirate (Lal, Bal, Pal) during an All-India agitation against the partition of Bengal. From his first foray into politics in 1888 for writing open letters to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan when he was hardly 23 until his martyrdom on 30 November 1928, Lajpat Rai remained in the forefront of every notable movement of social reform, national regeneration and political advancement of his peoples. Though

he became a bete noire of the anglo-saxon bureaucracy at a very young age, his name had come to be associated with political turmoil in the Punjab and even in the neighbouring provinces.

In 1907 British bureaucracy was gripped by the 'mutiny psychosis' or the prospect of a second mutiny exactly 50 years after 1857. Their panic was getting accentuated by daily doses of hysterical stuff in print conjuring up nightmarish scenes of their women and children being done to death in cold blood and their shrieks rending their ears. Vigilant to every emergent call they were determined to nip any such eventuality in the bud.

Coincidently in same year an agitation by the Punjab peasantry against the proposed canal colony legislation assumed the character of a popular uprising which the Punjab bureaucracy considered exceedingly dangerous and demanding of the most stringent measures. Sir Risely, Secretary to the Government of India, was briefed by E. Maclagan, The chief secretary of the Punjab about the dangerous and seditious activities of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh whose fiery speeches in the Lyallpur canal colony areas had won him wide acclaim and following. But in the report Lajpat Rai was dubbed a revolutionary and brain behind the whole agrarian unrest in the Punjab. As is now evident from the voluminous Minto Morley papers that Minto, the Viceroy was misled by Sir Denzil Ibbetson, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab into believing that Lajpat Rai was the head and centre of the entire movement in the Punjab and his most prominent agent in disseminating sedition was Ajit Singh. As a result Lajpat Rai was arrested from his home in Lahore and deported to Mandalay on May 9, 1907, under the Bengal Regulation III of 1818 without a hearing and without a trial before a lawfully constituted tribunal of justice. Just a few hours before his arrest Lajpat Rai penned briefly the real causes of the Punjab disturbances in a letter he wrote to The Punjabee. He listed the following reasons in a chronological order:

a. The letters and articles, etc., that appeared in The Civil and Military Gazette.
b. The prosecution of The Punjabee, but desisting from taking a similar action against The Civil and Military Gazette.
c. The Colonization Bill.

d. The Land Alienation Act Amendment Bill.
e. The increase in canal rates on the Bari Doaba Canal.
f. The abnormal upward revision of land revenue in the Rawalpindi District.
g. The appalling mortality from plague.

The news of Lajpat Rai's deportation spread like wild fire and provoked nationwide protests and adverse comments in the Press in India and abroad. 'Lala ji deported and Minto still alive' was Lokmanya Tilak's impromptu reaction when he came to know of it at the Poona Railway Station. P.M. Bapat gave an ultimatum that 'if Lajpat Rai was not released within three months he would shoot Morley.' Bande Matram gave the clarion call – 'for one Lajpat Rai taken away, hundreds Lajpats will arise in his place'. Sister Nivedita felt shocked and wrote in her diary 'is the government crazy?'

In the British Parliament questions were asked on May 13, 1907 even before Lajpat Rai had reached Mandalay. Morley had a tough time in defending the government action of arrest and deportation without trial. He was frequently rattled for this anti-British Act by such prominent leaders as V.H. Rutherford, O'Grady, Henry Cotton, Fredric Mackarness and many other prominent British leaders. Gokhale wrote to Wedderburn that Lajpat Rai's arrest has 'literally convulsed the country from one end to the other.' He pointed out that 'the Government of India had acted on the proposal of Sir D. Ibbetson to deport him in a state of panic.' Initially Morley sang the tune of Minto in supporting his policy on sedition. But soon he found himself caught in a tight corner.

Detained without a trial and with no defined sentence during his deportation, Lajpat Rai who was himself a lawyer of great standing, could very well see the illegality of the act. But 'knowing a bit of history' as he writes 'he despaired of getting any justice and fair play from despots and resolved to settle down in the life of bondage.' But when he came to know that a question had been put in the British Parliament seeking to know the substance of his protest, Lajpat Rai was keen to know the grounds on which his detention and deportation were based. The Warrant of Committal did not give any reasons. After obtaining a copy of the Warrant

he drew a petition to His Excellency, the Viceroy and Governor General of India. In this memorial he respectfully but emphatically protested his innocence and utterly denied that he did any such thing 'at the time of his arrest or before or after it as a result of which there was any commotion taking place in any part of the dominions of His Majesty, the King Emperor of India or which could otherwise justify the application of Regulation III of 1818'. He prayed that 'he be informed of the grounds on which action had been taken against him and the petition be forwarded to His Majesty, the King Emperor of India'.

In September 1907 Lajpat Rai learnt from a magazine that one of the charges against him was that of his having attempted to tamper with the Loyalty of the native army. This not only was an unfounded charge but a gross libel. He felt like filing a libel suit against certain newspapers spreading this canard and soon after his release he instituted cases of libel against them. But immediately he proceeded to address the second memorial to the Right honourable, the Secretary of State for India, London. In this memorial, like the previous one, Lajpat Rai protested his innocence and emphatically stated that he had done nothing calculated to cause commotion or attempted to tamper with the loyalty of the British Native Army or for that matter any thing that could make him liable under Regulation III of 1818. He protested how he was kept ignorant of the allegations against him and even denied access to newspapers. That he took no part in Lahore or Rawalpindi riots and did not make any speeches that could be considered seditious. That he had always been acting within the bounds of law and constitution in matter of expression of disapproval of certain measures of the government exercising the public mind. That he never advocated any violent or illegal method of redress. That the suspicion, if entertained against him of having tampered with the native soldiers of his Majesty's Army was entirely unfounded, for the petitioner had no opportunities whatsoever of mixing or communicating with the same.

The memorial finally raised a point of legal and constitutional nature in that the Regulation III was opposed to the letter and spirit of the British constitution and British Laws and hence ultra vires. He continues to pray that 'the provision of the said regulation

giving permanent powers for all times to come to the executive government to deprive British subjects of personal liberty without a proper trial by a court of justice are opposed to all notions of natural justice and government by law.' In the end 'the petitioner earnestly hopes that justice and fairplay for which the British nation and their government are renowned'—a set language in vogue for such memorials and which found great favour with Indian political leaders of his times subscribing to constitutionalism. Read in its entirety the memorial is no petition for clemency or mercy but makes out a clear and emphatic case on the basis of legal rights and constitutional practices and principles. It is addressed in a language of protest and a challenge to the much-vaunted British sense of justice and fairplay and very well brings out the patent illegality of the Regulation.

The very fact that the British government was forced to release him unconditionally vindicated Lajpat Rai's stand that the charge of sedition against him had no foundation in fact and could not be sustained in the event of a trial by a tribunal of justice. His analysis of the causes of agrarian unrest and ferment in Punjab was proved correct. For the peaceful conditions returned to the province the moment the Viceroy vetoed the Punjab Colonization Bill on the ground that 'it was a faulty piece of legislation'. On knowing better as to how he was misled into 'confusing unrest with sedition' by Sir Denzil Ibbetson, Minto wrote to Morley, 'As to Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh I have not a shadow of doubt that we must in common justice release them and that the sooner we do so the better. Now that we have declared the Punjab to be quiet we cannot logically justify their further imprisonment'.

Again the Punjab government could not produce even a shred of evidence against Lajpat Rai who was charged with hobnobbing with the Amir of Kabul to dislodge the British from India. After examining the entire case files and evidence Minto hastened to make an honest confession to Morley: "Lajpat Rai is undoubtedly a man of high character and very much respected by his fellow countrymen and if, when I was asked to arrest him, I had known what I do now, I should have required much more evidence before agreeing." Studying Lajpat Rai's files many months later Morley was shocked and wondered if he would be able to forgive

himself hereafter for the grievous wrong inflicted by the British bureaucracy on the person of Lala Lajpat Rai. When in parliament Mackarness asked Morley on June 18, if Lajpat Rai had made any protest against his arrest, Morley expressed his ignorance since the representation Lajpat Rai had submitted to the Secretary of State for India had been intercepted on the way. A bit longish though it would be revealing to quote what he has to say about this ugly episode for which he regretted:

"It seems clear from the papers that the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma refused Lajpat's request to see his solicitor. This is in itself, a hateful thing to do, only worthy of Russia, or, say Austrialia, in her Italian days. But worse still, I was allowed to tell the House of Commons that access to a solicitor would of course be allowed. In this, nobody in your government set me right… More than that, I was permitted to say that he was allowed to receive letters from his family. It now seems that some 50 such letters were stopped, and I was never told. Now, even the officials responsible in India, must surely know that in this country, which after all, is and means to be their master, for a Minister to mislead Parliament in matter of fact, is as heinous an offence as he can commit" (J. Morley to Minto, April 15, 1908, J. Morley Papers, Vol. III).

In sum, Lajpat Rai's arrest and deportation in 1907 was his first baptism in fire from which he emerged a high-minded statesman cast in a heroic mould. It blazed a trail of such examples of suffering and sacrifice for public causes and this considerably helped accelerate the pace of the Indian nationalist struggle. Even though he had clear differences with those adopting methods of militant struggle for the liberation of their country from foreign yoke, Lajpat Rai remained the symbol of militant nationalism and an inspiration for the youth. Revolutionaries like Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru wore the crown of martyrdom to avenge the assault on Lalaji which had led to his death. Widely acclaimed as the Punjab Kesari, the lion of Punjab, he occupies a prominent position in the galaxy of leaders who sacrificed their all for the freedom of the motherland. Gandhiji gave a touching tribute on Lajpat Rai's death in Young India of 22 November 1928: "Lala Lajpat Rai is dead. Long live Lalaji. Men like Lajpat Rai cannot die so long as the sun shines in the Indian sky."

2

Lajpat Rai's Political Views and Works

INTRODUCTORY

Now we are faced with the greatest and the grimmest struggle of all. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, not amongst men, but amongst nations " great and small, powerful and weak, exalted and humble," equality, fraternity, amongst peoples as well as amongst men " that is the challenge which has been thrown to us. . . .My appeal to the people of this country, and, if my appeal can reach beyond it, is this, that we should continue to fight for the great goal of international right and international justice, so that never again shall brute force sit on the throne of justice, nor barbaric strength wield the sceptre of right.

David Lloyd George

"Causes and Aims of the War." Speech delivered at Glasgow, on being presented with the freedom of that city, June 29, 1917

We are told that the world is going to be reconstructed on entirely new lines; that all nations, big or small, shall be allowed the right of self-determination; that the weaker and backward peoples will no longer be permitted to be exploited and dominated by the stronger and the more advanced nations of the earth; and that justice will be done to all. "What we seek," says President Wilson, "is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." The Indian people also form a part of the world that needs reconstructing. They constitute one-fifth of the human race, and inhabit about

two million square miles of very fertile and productive territory. They have been a civilized people for thousands of years, though their civilization is a bit different from that of the West. We advisedly say "a bit different," because in fundamentals that civilization has the same basic origin as that of Greece and Rome, the three peoples having originally sprung from the same stock and their languages, also, being of common descent. For the last 150 years, or (even) more, India has been ruled by Great Britain.

Her people have been denied any determining voice in the management of their own affairs. For over thirty years or more they have carried on an organized agitation for an autonomous form of Government within the British Empire. This movement received almost no response from the responsible statesmen of the Empire until late in the war. In the meantime some of the leaders grew sullen and downhearted, and, under the influence of bitter disappointment and almost of despair, took to revolutionary forms. The bulk of the people, however, have kept their balance and have never faltered in their faith in peaceful methods. When the war broke out the people of India at once realized the world significance of this titanic struggle and in no uncertain voice declared their allegiance to the cause of the Allies. Our masters, however, while gratefully accepting our economic contributions and utilizing the standing Indian army, spurned our offers for further military contributions. In the military development of the Indians they saw a menace to their supremacy in India.

The Russian Revolution first, and then the entry of the United States into the War, brought about a change in the point of view of the British statesmen. For the first time they realized that they could not win the war without the fullest cooperation of the people of India, both in the military and the economic sense and that the fullest cooperation of the United States also required as a condition precedent, quite a radical revision of their war aims. President Wilson's political idealism, his short, pithy and epigrammatic formulas compelled similar declarations by Allied statesmen. The British statesmen, at the helm of affairs, found it necessary to affirm their faith in President Wilson's principles and formulas if they would not let the morale of their own people at home suffer in comparison. In the meantime the situation in India

was becoming uncomfortable. The Nationalists and the Home Rulers insisted on a clear and unequivocal declaration of policy on the lines of President Wilson's principles. The British statesmen in charge of Indian affairs, at Whitehall, were still temporizing when the report of the Royal Commission on the causes of the Mesopotamia disaster burst out on the half-dazed British mind like a bombshell. To the awakening caused by the report and its disclosures a material contribution was made by the outspoken, candid and clear-cut speech of a younger statesman, whose knowledge of the working of the Indian Government could not be questioned. When the Parliament, press and platform were all ablaze with indignation and shame at the supposed incompetence of the Indian Government, to whose inefficiency and culpable neglect of duty were ascribed the series of disasters that ended with the surrender of a British force at Kut-el-amara, Mr. Edwin Samuel Montagu, who had been an Under Secretary for India under Lord Morley and was at the time of the Mesopotamia disaster

Minister of Munitions, came out with a strong and emphatic condemnation of the system and the form of Government under which the "myriads" of India lived and had their affairs managed. Mr. Montagu's opinion of the machinery of the Indian Government was expressed as follows:

"The machinery of Government in this country with its unwritten constitution, and the machinery of Government in our Dominions has proved itself sufficiently elastic, sufficiently capable of modification, to turn a peace-pursuing instrument into a war-making instrument. It is the Government of India alone which does not seem capable of transformation, and I regard that as based upon the fact that the machinery is statute-ridden machinery. The Government of India is too wooden, too iron, too inelastic, too antediluvian, to be any use for the modern purposes we have in view. I do not believe that anybody could ever support the Government of India from the point of view of modern requirements. But it would do. Nothing serious had happened since the Indian mutiny, the public was not interested in Indian affairs, and it required a crisis to direct attention to the fact that the Indian Government is an indefensible system of Government."

Regarding the Indian Budget Debates in Parliament, he said:

"Does anybody remember the Indian Budget Debates before the War? Upon that day the House was always empty. India did not matter, and the Debates were left to people on the one side whom their enemies sometimes called "bureaucrats", and on the other side to people whom their enemies sometimes called "seditionists," until it almost came to be disreputable to take part in Indian Debates. It required a crisis of this kind to realise how important Indian affairs were. After all, is the House of Commons to be blamed for that? What was the Indian Budget Debate? It was a purely academic discussion which had no effect whatever upon events in India, conducted after the events that were being discussed, had taken place."

He held that the salary of the Indian Secretary of State should be paid from the British Treasury, and then there would be real debates:

"How can you defend the fact that the Secretaries of State for India alone of all the occupants of the Front Bench, with the possible exception of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, are not responsible to this House for their salaries, and do not come here with their Estimates in order that the House of Commons may express its opinion. . . .

"What I am saying now is in the light of these revelations of this inelasticity of Indian government. However much you could gloss over those indefensible proceedings in the past, the time has now come to alter them.

"The tone of those Debates is unreal, unsubstantial and ineffective. If Estimates for India, like Estimates for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the Colonial Secretary were to be discussed on the floor of the House of Commons, the Debates on India would be as good as the Debates on foreign affairs. After all, what is the difference? Has it even been suggested to the people of Australia that they should pay the salary of the Secretary of State for the Colony? Why should the whole cost of that building in Charles Street, including the building itself, be an item of the Indian taxpayer's burden rather than of this House of Commons and the people of the country?"

Can and does the House of Commons control the India Office? Here is Mr. Montagu's answer.

"It has been sometimes questioned whether a democracy can rule an Empire. I say that in this instance the democracy has never had the opportunity of trying. But even if the House of Commons were to give orders to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State is not his own master. In matters vitally affecting India, he can be overruled by a majority of his Council. I may be told that the cases are very rare in which the Council has differed from the Secretary of State for India. I know one case anyhow, where it was a very near thing, and where the action of the Council might without remedy have involved the Government of India in a policy out of harmony with the declared policy of the House of Commons and the Cabinet. And these gentlemen are appointed for seven years, and can only be controlled from the Houses of Parliament by a resolution carried in both Houses calling on them for their resignations. The whole system of the India Office is designed to prevent control by the House of Commons for fear that there might be too advanced a Secretary of State. I do not say that it is possible to govern India through the intervention of the Secretary of State with no expert advice, but what I do say is that in this epoch now after the Mesopotamia Report, he must get his expert advice in some other way than by this Council of men, great men though, no doubt, they always are, who come home after lengthy service in India to spend the first years of their retirement as members of the Council of India.

"Does any Member of this House know much about procedure in the India Office? I have been to the India Office and to other offices. I tell this House that the statutory organization of the India Office produces an apotheosis of circumlocution and red tape beyond the dreams of any ordinary citizen."

His own idea of what should be done at that juncture was thus expressed:

"But whatever be the object of your rule in India, the universal demand of those Indians whom I have met and corresponded with, is that you should state it. Having stated it, you should give some instalment to show that you are in real earnest, some

beginning of the new plan which you intend to pursue, that gives you the opportunity of giving greater representative institutions in some form or other to the people of India....

"But I am positive of this, that your great claim to continue the illogical system of Government by which we have governed India in the past is that it was efficient. It has been proved to be not efficient. It has been proved to be not sufficiently elastic to express the will of the Indian people; to make them into a warring Nation as they wanted to be. The history of this War shows that you can rely upon the loyalty of the Indian people to the British Empire" if you ever before doubted it! If you want to use that loyalty, you must take advantage of that love of country which is a religion in India, and you must give them that bigger opportunity of controlling their own destinies, not merely by Councils which cannot act, but by control, by growing control, of the Executive itself. Then in your next War "if we ever have War" in your next crisis, through times of peace, you will have a contented India, an India equipped to help. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of expediency, it is not a question of desirability. Unless you are prepared to remodel, in the light of modern experience, this century-old and cumbrous machine, then, I believe, I verily believe, that you will lose your right to control the destinies of the Indian Empire."

The quick and resourceful mind of Premier Lloyd George at once grasped the situation. He lost no time in deciding what was needed. Probably over the head of his Tory colleagues, possibly with their consent, he gave the Indian portfolio to Mr. Montagu, and told him quietly to set to business. Mr. Montagu's first step was the announcement of August 20, 1917. On that date he made in the House of Commons the following memorable statement:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of

the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be that there should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India. His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided, with His Majesty's approval, that I should accept the Viceroy's invitation to proceed to India to discuss these matters with the Viceroy and the Government of India, to consider with the Viceroy the views of local Governments, and to receive with him the suggestions of representative bodies and others.

"I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance, and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility.

"Ample opportunity will be afforded for public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to Parliament."

It is obvious that the content of the second sentence of paragraph two in the above announcement is in fundamental opposition to the right of every nation to self-determination, a principle now admitted to be of general application (including, according to the British Premier, even the black races inhabiting the Colonies that were occupied by Germany before the War, within its purview). The people of India are not on the level of these races. Even if it be assumed that they are not yet in a position to exercise that right, fully and properly, it is neither right nor just to assume that they shall never be in that position even hereafter. The qualifications implied in that sentence are, besides, quite needless and superfluous. As long as India remains "an integral part of the British Empire" she cannot draft a constitution which does not meet with the approval of the British Parliament and the British Sovereign. It is to be regretted that the British statesmen could not rise equal to the spirit of the times and make an announcement free from that spirit of autocratic bluster and racial swagger which was entirely out of place at a time when they were

making impassioned appeals to Indian manhood to share the burdens of Empire by contributing ungrudgingly in men and money for its defence. This attitude is somewhat inconsistent with the statements in paragraph 179 of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, wherein, after referring to the natural evolution of "the desire for self-determination," the distinguished authors of the Report concede that "the demand that now meets us from the educated classes of India is no more than the right and natural outcome of the work of a hundred years."

In spite of this uncalled for reservation in the announcement, it is perfectly true that "the announcement marks the end of one epoch and the beginning of a new one." What makes the announcement "momentous," however, is not the language used, as even more high-sounding phrases have been used before by eminent British statesmen of the position of Warren Hastings, Macaulay, Munroe, Metcalf and others, but the fact that the statement has been made by the Secretary of State for India, as representing the Crown and the Cabinet who, in their turn, are the constitutional representatives of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. The statement is thus both morally and legally binding on the British people, though it will not acquire that character so far as the people of India are concerned, unless it is embodied in a Statute of Parliament. Is it too much to hope that when that stage comes the second sentence of the second paragraph might be omitted or so modified as to remove the inconsistency pointed out above?

We have no doubt, however, that the language of the announcement notwithstanding, the destiny of India remains ultimately in the hands of the Indians themselves. It will be determined, favorably or unfavorably, by the solidity of their public life, by the purity and idealism of the Indian public men to be hereafter entrusted with the task of administration, by the honesty and intensity of their endeavor to uplift the masses, both intellectually and economically, by the extent to which they reduce the religious and communal excuses that are being put forth as reasons for half-hearted advance, and by the amount of political unity they generate in the nation. The well known maxim that those who will must by themselves be free, is as good today as

ever. They will have to do all this in order to persuade the British Parliament to declare them fit for responsible Government. Once they show their fitness by deeds and by actual conduct, no one can keep them in leading-strings. Coming back to the announcement itself, would it not be well to bear in mind that what differentiates this announcement from the statutory declarations of the Act of 1833 and the Royal proclamation of 1858 is not the language used but the step or steps taken to ascertain Indian opinion, to understand and interpret it in accordance with the spirit of the times and the frankness and fairness with which the whole problem is stated in the joint report of the two statesmen, who are the present official heads of the Government of India. Nor can it be denied that the announcement and the report have received the cordial appreciation of the Indian leaders.

We, that is, the Indian Nationalists, have heretofore concerned ourselves more with criticism of the British administration than with the problem of construction, though our criticism has never been merely destructive. We have always ended with constructive suggestions. Henceforth, if the spirit of the announcement is translated into deeds it will be our duty to cooperate actively in constructive thought. Not that we refused cooperation in the past, but the conditions and the terms on which we were asked to cooperate made it impossible for us to make an effective response.

Several British critics of the Indian Nationalists have from time to time charged them with lack of constructive ability. They ignore the fact that political conditions in India were an effective bar to any display of ability.

The first attempt at constitution making was made by the Congress in 1915, and as such was bound to be rather timid and half-hearted. The situation since then has considerably improved and the discussions of the last twelve months have enabled the Secretary for India and the Viceroy to claim that, in certain respects, at least, their scheme is a more effective step towards responsible Government than the scheme promulgated jointly by the Congress and the Muslim League. How far that claim can be substantiated remains to be seen. This much is, however, clear: come what may, along with the rest of the world, India cannot go back to the pre-war conditions of life. The high functionaries of the British

Government in India are also conscious of that fact, as one of them, the present Lieutenant Governor of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, a member of the Indian bureaucracy, remarked only recently in a speech at Allahabad:

> *"Nothing will ever be the same," said Sir Harcourt Butler; "this much is certain, that we shall have to shake up all our old ideals and begin afresh ... we have crossed the watershed and are looking down on new plains. The old oracles are dumb. The old shibboleths are no more heard. Ideals, constitutions, rooted ideas are being shovelled away without argument or comment or memorial. . . . Our administrative machine belongs to another age. It is top-heavy. Its movements are cumbrous, slow, deliberate. It rejoices in delay. It grew up when time was not the object, when no one wanted change, when financial economy was the ruling passion of Governments, imperial and provincial. Now there are the stirrings of young national life, and economic springtime, a calling for dispatch, quick response, bold experiment. Secretariats with enormous offices overhang the administration. An eminent ecclesiastic once told me that Rome had, by centuries of experience, reduced ! delay to a science; he used to think her mistress of postponement and procrastination, but the Government of India beat Rome every time. Only ecclesiastics could dare so to speak of the Government of India. I, for one, will not lay audacious hands on the chariot of the sun."*

Coming, as it does, from a member of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, this statement means much more to the Indian people than even the words of the British Premier. If this statement is not mere camouflage, but represents a genuine change of heart on the part of the British bureaucracy in India, then it is all the more inexplicable to us why the new scheme of the Secretary for India and the Viceroy should breathe so much distrust of the educated classes of India. Any way, we have nothing but praise for the spirit of frankness and fairness which generally characterizes the report. However we might disagree with the conclusions arrived at, it is but right to acknowledge that the analysis of the problem and its constituting elements is quite masterly and the attempt to find a solution which will meet the needs of the situation as

understood by them absolutely sincere and genuine. This fact makes it all the more necessary that Indian

Nationalists of all classes and all shades of opinion should give their best thought to the consideration of the problem in a spirit of construction and cooperation, as distinguished from mere fault-finding. Nor should it be forgotten for a moment that Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford were all the time, when drawing their scheme, influenced by considerations of what, under the circumstances, is practicable and likely to be accepted, not only in India by the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy and the non-official European community, but by the conservative British opinion at home.

It is the latter we have to convince and win over before the scheme has a ghost of a chance of being improved upon. When we say conservative opinion we include in that expression the Liberal and Labour Imperialists also. We should never forget that it is I hard to part with power, however idealistic the individual vested with power may be, and it is still harder to throw away the chances of profit which one (and those in whom one is interested) have gained by efforts extending over a century and a half, and in the exercise of which one sees no immediate danger. I am of the opinion that hitherto Indian representation in England has been extremely meager, spasmodic and inadequate to the needs of the situation. Outside England, India's voice has been altogether unheard.

We have so far displayed an almost unpardonable simplicity in failing to recognise that the world is so situated these days that public opinion in one country sometimes reacts quite effectively on public opinion in another. It is our duty, therefore, to increase our representation in England and to keep our case before the world with fresh energy and renewed vigour, not in a spirit of carping denunciation of the British Government of India, but with a desire to educate and enlist liberal and right-minded opinion all over the world in our favor. In the following pages an attempt is made to examine the Montagu-Chelmsford report in a spirit of absolute candour and fairness, with practical suggestions for the improvement of the scheme in the light of Indian and British criticism thereupon.

DEMOCRACY IN INDIA

Before we take up the report of the Secretary for India and the Viceroy we intend to clear the ground by briefly meeting the almost universal impression that prevails in educated circles in the West, that democratic institutions are foreign to the genius of the Asiatic peoples and have never been known in India before. The latest statement to this effect was made by Mr. Reginald Coupland of the Round Table Quarterly, in an article he contributed to the New Republic (September 7, 1918) on "Responsible Government in India." We have neither the time nor the desire to go into the question as it relates to other Asiatic countries, though we might state, in general terms, that an impartial study of Asiatic history will disclose that in the centuries preceding the Reformation in Europe, Asia was as democratic or undemocratic as Europe. Since then democracy has developed on modern lines in Europe. While Asia has gradually disintegrated and fallen under foreign domination, Europe has progressed towards democracy. As regards India, however, we intend to refer briefly to what historical evidence is available.

Firstly, we wish to make clear what we under- stand by "democracy." There is no desire to enter into an academic discussion of the subject nor to burden this book with quotations from eminent thinkers and writers. In our judgment, the best definition of democracy so far has been furnished by Abraham Lincoln, viz., "the government of the people, by the people and for the people," regardless of the process or processes by which that government is constituted. One must, however, be clear minded as to what is meant by "the people." Does the expression include all the people that inhabit the particular territory to which the expression applies, regardless of sex, creed, color and race, or does it not? If it does, we are afraid there is little democracy even in Europe and America today. Until recently half of the population was denied all political power in the State by virtue of sex.

Of the other half a substantial part was denied that right by virtue of economic status or, to be more accurate, by lack of economic status considered necessary for the exercise of political power. Even now the Southern States of the United States, Amendment XV to the American Constitution notwithstanding, effectively bar the colored people from the exercise of the franchise supposed to have been accorded to them by the amendment. In Europe, religious and social bars still exist in the constitutions of the different states. As Great Britain is supposed to be the most democratic country in Europe, we cannot do better than take the history of the growth of public franchise in that country as the best illustration of the growth of democracy in the terms of President Lincoln's formula.

Travelling backwards, the earliest democratic in- situations known to Europe were those of Greece and Rome. In applying the term " democratic" to the city republics of Greece and Rome it is ignored that these "republics" were in no sense democratic. "Liberty," says Putnam Weale, "as it was understood in those two celebrated republics of Athens and Sparta meant abject slayer to the mass of the population, slavery every whit as cruel as any in the Southern States of the American Union before the war of Liberation. ... In neither of these two republics did the freemen ever exceed twenty thousand, whilst the slaves ran into hundreds of thousands, and were used just as the slaves of Asiatics were used.

Thus the Greek republics were simply cities in which a certain portion of the inhabitants, little qualified to exercise them, had acquired exclusive privileges, while they kept the great body of their brethren in a state of abject slavery." Discussing the nature of Roman citizenship Putnam Weale remarks (p. 25) that "in spite of the polite fiction of citizenship, the destinies of scores of millions were effectively disposed of by a few thousands." This was true not only with regard to the outlying parts of the Empire but even as to Italy itself. "Roman liberty," continues Putnam Weale, " though an improvement on Greek conceptions, was like all liberty of antiquity confined really to those who, being present in the capital, could take '– an active part in the public deliberations. It was the liberty of city and not of a land. It was therefore exactly similar in practise, if not in theory, to the kind of liberty, which has always been understood in advanced Asiatic states " the system of Government by equipoise and nothing else. The idea of giving those who lived at a distance from the capital any means of representing themselves was never considered at all; and so,

it was the populace of the capital (or only a part of it), aided by such force as might be introduced by the contesting generals or leaders, which held all the actual political power. Representative Government ,

" *the only effective guarantee of liberty of any sort*

" *had therefore not yet been dreamt of."*

Alison in his History of Europe, Vol. I, says: "The states of Florence, Genoa, VenicSicffti Pisa were not in reality free ; they were communities in which a few I individuals had usurped the rights, and disposed of the fortunes, of the great bulk of their fellow citizens, whom they governed as subjects or indeed as slaves. During the most flourishing period of their history, he citizens of all Italian republics did not amount to 20,000, and these privileged classes held as many million in subjection. The citizens of Venice were 2500 and those of Genoa 4500, those of Pisa, Siena, Lucea and Florence taken together, not above 6000. " [Italics ours.] Coming to more modern times we find it stated by Morse Stephens in his History of Revolutionary Europe that "the period which preceded the French Revolution and the era of war from the troubles of which Modern Europe was to be born may be characterised as that of the benevolent despots.

The State was everything, the nation nothing." Speaking of the eighteenth-century conditions in Europe, Stephens remarks that "the great majority of the peasants of Europe were throughout that century absolute serfs"; also that "the mass of the population of Central and Eastern Europe was purely agricultural and in its poverty expected naught but the bare necessaries of existence. The cities and consequently the middle classes formed but an insignificant factor in the population." These quotations reveal the real character of the European democracy in ancient and mediaeval and even in early modern Europe up to the end of the eighteenth century, or, to be more accurate, to the time of the French Revolution. Compare this with the following facts about the political institutions of India, during the ancient and mediaeval times: First we have the testimony of ancient Brahmanic and Buddhistic literature, preserved in their sacred books, about the right of the people to elect their rulers; the duty of the rulers to obey the law and their obligation to consult their ministers as well

as the representatives of the public in all important affairs of State. The Vedic literature contains references to non- monarchial forms of Government, makes mention of elected rulers and of assemblies of people, though the normal as distinguished from universal form of Government according to Professor Macdonald was by Kings, "a situation which, as in the case of the Aryan invaders of Greece and of the German invaders of England, resulted almost necessarily in strengthening the monarchic element of the constitution."

In the Aitreya Brahmana occur terms which are translated by some as representing the existence of "self -governed" and "kingless" states. These authorities have been collected, translated and explained by K. P. Tayas Wal and Narendranath Law in a series of articles published in the Modern Review of Calcutta.

The Mahabharata, the great Hindu epic, makes mention of kingless states or oligarchies. "In fact," says Mr. Banerjea, "all the Indian nations of these times possessed popular institutions of some type or other."

Professor Rhys Davids has said, in his Buddhist India, that "the earliest Buddhist records reveal the survival side by side with more or less powerful monarchies, of republics with either complete or modified independence." He names ten such republics in Northern India alone. In regard to the system of Government effective within one of the tribes that constituted a republic of their own, the same scholar observes: "The administrative and judicial business of the clan was carried out in public assembly, at which young and old were alike present in their common Mote Hall. A single chief " how and for what period chosen we do not know " was elected an officeholder, presiding over the sessions, or, if there were no sessions, over the State. He bore the title of Raja, which must have meant something like the Roman Consul or the Greek Archon." 6 There is no evidence of the existence of slaves "of serfs in these communities. Evidently all were freemen.

We have the evidence of Greek historians of the period who accompanied Alexander in his Asiatic Campaign, or who, after Alexander's death, represented Greek monarchs at the courts of Indian rulers. "Even as late as the date of Alexander's invasion," says Mr. Banerjea, "many of the nations of the Punjab lived under

democratic institutions." Speaking of one of them called Ambasthas (Sambastai), the Greek author of Ancient India says: "They lived in cities in which the democratic form of Government prevailed." "Curtius," adds Mr. Banerjea, "mentions a powerful Indian tribe, where the form of Government was democratic, and not regal." Similarly Arrian, another Greek writer, is quoted as mentioning several other independent, self-governing tribal communities who lived under democratic forms of government and bravely resisted the advance of Alexander. One of them, when making submission to Alexander, told him Jhat "they were attached more than any others to freedom and autonomy, and that their freedom they had preserved intact from the time Dionysos came to India until Alexander's invasion." There were some others which had an aristocratic form of Government. In one of them mentioned in Ancient India, "the administration was in the hands of three hundred wise men." Another Greek writer, Diodoros, speaks of Patala as "a City of great note with a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan." It may safely be presumed that the Greek meant what he said. Chanakya, the author of a great treatise on political science, mentions many powerful oligarchies that existed down to the fourth century a.d. In one of the inscriptions, said to be of the sixth century a.d., the Malavas are referred to as living under a republican form of Government.

Even when kingship became an established institution the idea that the King was only a servant of the people survived for a long time. His " remuneration " was fixed at one-sixth of the produce. His subjects had the right to depose him or to turn him out if he failed in his duty. The authorities on these points are collected by Mr. Banerjea on pp. 72 and 73 of his book.

Similarly many authorities are quoted by Mr. Banerjea on pp. 74 and 75 of his learned work showing that, according to Hindu ideals practised in ancient times, the king was not above the law. He was not an autocrat" He "was as much bound by the law as his subjects. Laws' were not made by kings. "Legislation was not among the powers entrusted to a king," says Mr. Banerjea. "There is no reference in early Vedic literature to the exercise of legislative authority by the king, though later it is an essential part of his duties," says Prof. Macdonell.

Assemblies and councils are quite frequently mentioned both in the Rig and the Atharva Vedas. "The popular assembly was a regular institution in the early years of the Buddhistic age (500 to 300 B.C.) " Chanakya mentions that in the King's Council the decision of the majority should prevail. Sukraniti lays down elaborate rules of procedure for the conduct of business in these assemblies. "The Council was the chief administrative authority in the kingdom. The King was supposed not to do anything without the consent of the Council." In Kerala State, South India, during the first and second centuries of the Christian Era, there were five assemblies one of which consisted of "representatives of the people summoned from various parts of the State." "From the Ceylon inscriptions we learn that in that island all measures were enacted by the King in Council, and all orders were issued by and under the authority of the Council."

While all this is true of Ancient India, we cannot claim the existence of the same system of Government for mediaeval India. Even as regards Ancient India, all that is claimed is that it possessed as much democracy, if not more, as Ancient Greece or Ancient Rome. The non-existence of slavery in Northern I India gives it therefore a superior character to that of I the Ancient republics of Greece and Rome. In the South, it is believed slavery did exist. Coming to mediaeval times generally known as the Mohammedan period of Indian History consisting of two epochs, from 400 to 1200 a.d. and from 1200 to 1800 a.d., we notice that the country enjoyed a durable kind of government, cities under absolute rule, and villages, . as before, self-governed. The absolute rule was a ' benevolent or malevolent despotism according to the character of the Hindu or Moslem sovereign who reigned. But in the villages India maintained a democratic form of government right up to the beginning of British rule; and though under British rule, it has been practically superseded by the rule of the officials, yet in some parts of the country the spirit is still alive, as will appear from the following testimony recorded by Mr. Sidney Webb in his Preface to Mr. John Matthai's volume, Village Government in British India:

"One able collector of long service in Central India informed me that he had been, until a few months before, totally unaware

that anything of the sort existed in any of the villages over which he ruled. But being led to make specific inquiries on the subject, he had just discovered, in village after village, a distinctly effective if somewhat shadowy, local organization, in one or other form of panchayat, which was, in fact, now and I then giving decisions on matters of communal concern, adjudicating civil disputes, and even condemning offenders to reparation and fine. Such a Local Government organization is, of course, 'extra-legal,' and has no statutory warrant, and, in the eyes of the British tribunals, possesses no authority whatever. But it has gone on silently existing, possibly for longer than the British Empire itself, and is still effectively functioning, merely by common consent and with the very real sanction of the local public opinion." Mr. Matthai has also made a similar remark in Paragraph 22 of his book (Introductory).

Village councils ordinarily called village panchayats have often been confounded with caste panchayats and that fact has been emphasised to prove that these Indian panchayats were or are anything but democratic. Mr. Sidney Webb and Mr. John Matthai both have controverted that position and upon good evidence. Says Mr. Webb:

"One suggestion that these fragments of indigenous Indian Local Government seem to afford sometimes tend to exaggerate the extent to which the cleavages of caste have prevailed over the community of neighbourhood. How often is one informed, 'with authority,' that the panchayat of which we catch glimpses must be only a caste panchayat! It is plain, on the evidence, that however frequent and potent may be the panchayat of a caste, there have been and still are panchayats of men of different castes, exercising the functions of a Village. Council over villagers of different castes. How widely prevalent these may be not even the Government of India can yet inform us. But if people would only look for traces of Village Government, instead of mainly for evidences of caste dominance, we might learn more on the subject."

Later on in the same paragraph Mr. Webb remarks that, even where caste exists it has, in fact, permitted a great deal of common life, and that it is compatible with active village councils.

Besides the evidence furnished by the texts of Hindu codes, law books and political treatises (like the Arthasastra of Kautilaya), and Niti Shastra, etc., other good evidence has been produced by Mr. Matthai in support of the above-mentioned proposition.

In Paragraph 23 he refers to the Madras Epigraphic Report, 191 2-13, in support of the statement that "there were village assemblies in South India in the tenth century a.d., which 'appear to have consisted of all the residents of a village including cultivators, professionals and merchants. '"

"In the Private Diary of Anandaranga Pillay, who served as agent to Dupleix, the French Governor in South India in the middle of the eighteenth century, there is an entry referring to a village meeting to consider a case of desecrating the village temple 'in which people of all castes " from the Brahman to the Pariah " took part.'" In Paragraph 24, he points out that a village council (Panchayat) might either be an assembly of all the inhabitants of the village or only a select committee consisting of representatives selected on some recognized principle. The first are common among less developed communities like those of the aboriginal tribes and the latter in more highly organized communities.

Evidences of bigger assemblies consisting of representatives of more than one village, sometimes of more than one district, to decide cases of importance or dispute between whole villages are also cited in Paragraphs 26 and 27 and 32. On the strength of certain South Indian Inscriptions relating to the Tamil Kingdoms of the 10th century a.d., it is stated that the administration of the village was carried on by no less than five or six committees, each vested with jurisdiction relating to certain definite departments of village life, though there was no fixed rule on the point. In Paragraphs 33 and 34 the mode of election to the committees and the qualifications for membership are set down in detail. The procedure seems to have been quite elaborate, though suited to the level of intelligence of the people concerned. These village councils and committees looked after education, sanitation, poor relief, public works, watch and ward, and the administration of justice. To describe the methods by which these departments of village life were administered by the village councils requires too much space, but we give two excerpts from Chapter II on education:

> *"The history of village education in India goes back perhaps to the beginnings of the village community. The schoolmaster had a definite place assigned to him in the village economy, in the same manner as the headman, the accountant, the watch- man, and the artisans. He was an officer of the village community, paid either by rent-free lands or by assignments of grain out of the village harvest."*

> *"The outstanding characteristics of the schools of the Hindu village community were: (i) that they were democratic, and (2) that they were more secular than spiritual in their instruction and their general character. . . . Nevertheless, when we speak of the democratic character of these early Hindu schools, it is to be understood that they were democratic only in this sense, that they were open not merely to the priestly caste but to all the four superior castes alike. There was never any question of admitting into the schools those who lay outside the regular caste system whose touch would have meant pollution, nor to the great aboriginal populations of the country."*

> *"This is very similar to the public schools in the Southern States, in the United States, where schools for the white children are closed to coloured children and vice versa."*

From what has been stated above it appears that the general impression that democratic institutions are entirely foreign to India is nothing but the survival of a prejudice originally due to ignorance of Indian history. In collecting his evidence Mr. Matthai has principally drawn upon South Indian sources. There can be no doubt that abundant evidence of a similar kind is available as regards North India and is waiting to be collected, collated and sifted by other Matthais. We do not contend that India had the same kind of representative institutions as Modern Europe has. In fact no part of the world had.

They are all recent developments. It is clear that idea was never altogether absent from Indian life either in theory or in practise. Even under the most absolute autocracies, the bulk of the people managed their collective affairs themselves. They organised and maintained schools; arranged and paid for sanitation; built public works; provided for watch and ward; administered justice, and for all these purposes raised revenues and spent them in a democratic way. They did so, not only as regards the internal affairs of a village, but applied the same principles in the larger life of their district or districts. Such a people cannot be said to have always lived a life dictated and held together by force. Nor can it be said with justice that the introduction of modern democratic methods in such a country, among such a people, would be the introduction of an exotic plant, with the spirit and working of which it will take them centuries to be familiar.

THE PRESENT IDEALS

Every nation has a fundamental right to determine, fix and work out her own ideals. Any interference with this right by individuals or nations of foreign origin is unnatural and unjust. The consent of the governed is the only logical and just basis of governments. These principles have been reiterated with added force and masterly eloquence by President Wilson in his addresses during the War. They have been accepted and adopted by the Allied statesmen. No statesman or publicist of standing in any of the Allied countries can dare question the principles. The difficulty, however, arises when we come to apply them practically. At this point the practical politician's genius for diplomacy discovers flaws that provide excuses for the non-application of those principles if such course seems helpful to his nation or his sovereign.

President Wilson has asseverated that "the day of conquest and aggrandisement is gone," which, in plain language, means that the day of Imperialism is over. And, in conformity with the principle stated in the Declaration of Independence, that "All nations have the right to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them," President Wilson has also said that "every people have a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live"; that "national aspirations must be respected, and that 'self determination' is not a mere phrase; it is an imperative principle of action, which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril." Yet as practical men we must not ignore the facts of life. The world is not at once going to be an ideal place to live in even if it may become one. It may be that the advanced nations of the earth which just now divide the political and economic

control of the world between themselves may accept the underlying policy of the following statement (of President Wilson) that:

"This war had its roots in the disregard of the rights of small nations and of nationalities which lacked the union and the force to make good their claim to deter- mine their own allegiance and their own forms of political life."

And the proposed League of Nations might see that a continuance of the injustice thus far done to small or backward nations is no longer permitted. Being practical men, however, we cannot build on the assumption that at the end of this war the world is at once to be transformed into a paradise and that full justice will be done to all nations and all peoples alike. We already notice a tendency to restrict the application and the enforcement of these principles to the nations of Europe by the more frequent use of the term "free nations." "Free nations" do not need to be freed. It will be wise, therefore not to be carried off our feet by these declarations and statements. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have pointedly reminded us of the Indian saying, "hanoz Delhi Dur Ast" (i.e. "Delhi is yet far away"). But even if they had not done so we were not so simple as to be swept away by the mere language of the war declarations.

The wording of the announcement of August 20, 191 7, itself did not leave us in doubt about the truth of the saying quoted by Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford. We have, therefore, to test our ideals and aspirations by the touchstone of practicability and expediency. Happily for us there is, in theory, at least, a full agreement between the political goal set up by the Indian Nationalists of the Congress school (since endorsed by the Home Rulers) and that set up by the authors of the announcement of August 20th.

This goal is " Self- Government within the Empire on terms of equality with the other parts of it," in the language of the Congress school or, "Responsible Government as an integral part of the British Empire," in the language of the announcement. There is a party of Indian politicians who want complete independence, but at present their number is so limited that we need not take serious consideration of their position in the matter. The vast bulk of the educated classes are agreed:

(a) That they are content to remain within the British Empire if they are allowed a status of equality with the self-governing dominions of the Empire.

(b) That what they want is an autonomous Government on the lines of Canada, Australia and the South African Union.

(c) That they do not want any affiliation with any' other Foreign Government.

Much has been written and said about the loyalty of the people of India to the British Government. Opinions, however, differ as to its nature. Some say it is the loyalty of a helpless people or, in other words, a loyalty dictated by-fear or force." Others say it is the loyalty of opportunism. The British maintain that the loyalty is the outcome of a genuine and sincere appreciation of the blessings of the British Empire. Be that as it may, it is in the interest of both to bring about circumstances and conditions which would transform this loyalty whatever its nature into one of genuine affection and interest. The announcement of August 20, 191 7, may be considered as a first step towards the creation of such loyalty, but much will depend on the steps that are taken to give practical effect to the policy embodied in the said announcement and on the spirit in which they proposed reforms are carried out. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford's conception of the " eventual future of India is a sisterhood of states, self-governing in all matters of purely local or provincial interest, in some cases corresponding to existing provinces, in others perhaps modified in area according to the character and economic interests of their people. Over this congeries of States should preside a Central Government increasingly representative of and responsible to the people of all of them; dealing with matters, both internal and external, of common interest to the whole of India; acting as arbiter in interstate relations and representing the interests of all India on equal terms with the self-governing units of the British Empire."

The only changes that we would propose in the language of this statement are (i) the omission of the word " increasingly " which is rather misplaced in the conception of an ideal, and (ii) the substitution of the word "Commonwealth" in place of " Empire." His Highness the Aga Khan considers the use of the

term "responsible" government instead of "self- government" in the announcement as unfortunate because it carries the technical meaning of a government responsible for its existence to an assembly elected by the people. On the other hand, self-government can comprise many and varied forms of expression of the popular will. Further, he is convinced that the words "responsible government" were used in order to carry with the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister some more conservative members of the small war cabinet. It was camouflaged so that the Executive government hereafter might contain English- men, while at the same time the administration became sufficiently liberal to be responsible to the people. With due respect to the Aga Khan we do not see the logical connection between the two. Responsible government may or may not involve the necessary inclusion of Englishmen in the Cabinet. Although we may not approve of the interpretation of the expression "responsible" government given to it by the authors of the report, in our judgment its use as an ideal to be attained expresses more forcibly the right of the people to choose their government than the use of the general term "self government " would.

THE STAGES

In the chapter on ideals we have shown that there is almost complete agreement between the bulk of Indian educated men and the British authorities as to the immediate goal of Government in India. There is no such agreement, however, as regards the stages by which that goal is to be reached, nor on the steps which should be immediately taken to carry us to the first stage. The four formulas by which Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford profess to be guided in their recommendations are not accepted in their entirety by the spokesmen of the Indian people. These formulas are:

(1) There should be as far as possible complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control. (Paragraph 188.)

(2) The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realization of responsible government should be taken. Some measure of responsibility should be given at once, and our aim is to give complete responsibility as soon as conditions permit. This involves at once giving the provinces the largest measure of independence, legislative, administrative, and financial, of the Government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities. (Paragraph 189.)

(3) The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament, and saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable pending experience of the effect of the changes now to be introduced in the provinces. In the meantime the Indian Legislative Council should be enlarged and made more representative and its opportunities of influencing government increased. (Paragraph 190.)

(4) In proportion as the foregoing changes take effect, the control of Parliament and the Secretary of State over the Government of India and provincial Governments must be relaxed. (Paragraph 191.)

There is no difficulty in accepting the first and the fourth formulas. There is some complaint that the actual steps recommended for immediate adoption to give effect to the policy of the first formula are not in keeping with the spirit of the formula and are inadequate. But this we can reserve for future consideration.

No objection can be taken to the first and the last sentences of the second formula; though there is a great divergence of opinion as regards the content of the second. It is maintained by some, and their number is by no means small, 1 that full responsibility should be conceded to the provinces at once and that there is nothing in the conditions mentioned in the report which justifies the postponement thereof.

The third formula, however, is the one about which there is not even a semblance of agreement. All political parties and all qualified persons in India (we mean, of course, Indians of Indian origin) are agreed that the assumptions and presumptions upon which this formula is based are wrong and unacceptable. Native Indian opinion is fairly unanimous on the point.

There are some who claim full autonomy at once. There are others who claim full autonomy except as regards foreign relations, the control of native States, the Army and the Navy. All insist that a beginning of responsible Government must be made in the Central Government also, and point out the absolute necessity of conceding some measure, even if not full, of fiscal autonomy. They can see no reason why "the Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament " and why "its authority must remain indisputable." On these matters Indian opinion joins issue with the distinguished authors of the report. We will revert to the subject in another chapter.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Immensity of the Problem and the Gravity of the Task

Before we take up the two sets of facts relied upon by them in support of either position we may express our general agreement with them as regards the gravity of the task and the immensity of the problem. The size of the country and the vastness of its population are the measure of the extent of the problem. The existence of powerful vested interests at present possessed by the ruling race which may be interfered with by extended changes in the system of Government are the measure of its gravity. "The welfare and happiness of hundreds of millions of people," which the authors say are in issue cannot be adequately provided for by any autocratic system of Government however benevolent its purpose, and however magnificent its organisation. An "absolute government" is an anarchism, but when it is foreign it is doubly so. To bring out "the best in the people" for their own "welfare and happiness" as well as for that of mankind in general, it is necessary that the people should be free to develop on their own lines, manage their own affairs, evolve their own life, subject only to such restrictions as the general interests of humanity demand; and subject to such guidance as the better placed and more experienced people of the earth can furnish.

The people of India are willing to be guided in their development towards modern democracy by the people of Great Britain and they would be grateful for their cooperation in this difficult task, but they must be made to realize that the task is their

own and that they should undertake it in a spirit of courageous faith " faith in their destiny, faith in their ability to achieve it, and faith in the friendship of the great British nation. The test of all measures in relation to the Government of India in future should be, not how far the people of India can cooperate, how far they can be entrusted with responsibility, but how far it is necessary in their interests to control and check them. The difference between the two points of view is fundamental and important. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have looked at the problem from the former point of view; the Indian leaders want them to look at it from the latter.

They want the great British nation to recognise the justice of India's claim to manage her own affairs, and to keep in their hands in future only such control as is absolutely necessary (a) to enable the Indian people to conduct their business efficiently and successfully, (b) to make them fulfill their obligations to the great Commonwealth of nations of which they hope soon to be a component part. As long as British statesmen insist on looking at the problem from the former point of view, they will make mistakes and raise a not entirely unreason- able suspicion of their motives. The moment they adopt the other point of view, they remove all grounds . of distrust and create an atmosphere of friendliness in which they can deal with the problem in a spirit of mutual trust, absolute frankness and candid perspicacity.

There are many contentions of the British– statesmen which the educated Indians would gladly I admit to be valid and necessary were they sure that their admission would not be used against them by I the power whom they habitually regard as their adversary. There is much in this report which could at once be struck out if both parties were actuated by feelings of mutual trust and friendliness. It cannot be denied that many of the proposed restrictions on the power of the popular assemblies and the would-be Indian Administrators are the outcome of distrust. It is no wonder then that the Indian leaders in their turn are not quite sure of the face value of the many professions of good will that characterise the scheme. It is for the removal of this distrust that we appeal as earnestly as we can to the better mind of Great Britain.

In looking at the conditions of the problem, there is another fallacy which underlies the oft-exaggerated estimates of the blessings of British rule in India by British statesmen and British publicists. They compare the India of today with the India of 1757 and at once jump to the conclusion that "the moral and material civilisation of the Indian people has made more progress in the last fifty years than during all the preceding centuries of their history." The proper comparison is of the Great Britain, the France, the United States, the Germany, the Italy and the Japan of 1757, with the India of that year and of India's progress within the last century and a half, or even within the last 50 years, with the progress of these countries in the same period. We have no desire to withhold credit for what Great Britain has done in India, but what she has misdone or could have done but failed to do, by virtue of her rule in India being absolute and thus necessarily conditioned by limitations inevitable in a system of absolute rule, should not be forgotten.

The Indian critics of British rule in India have repeatedly pointed out that what they condemned and criticised was the system and not the personnel of the Government, and the distinguished authors of the Report "very frankly recognise that the character of political institutions reacts upon the character of the people" and that the exercise of responsibilities calls forth capacity for it (Paragraph 130), which mainly accounts for the conditions that serve as reasons for withholding responsible government from the Indian people. In discussing "the basis of responsibility" Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford very properly point out that the qualities necessary for it are only developed by exercise and that though "they are greatly affected by education, occupation and social organisation" " they ultimately rest on the traditions and habits of the people." " We cannot go simply to statistics for the measure of these things." Yet, unfortunately, it is exactly these statistics that seem to have influenced them largely in the framing of their half-hearted measures. The two dominating conditions which obsess them are (1) that the immense masses of the people are poor, ignorant and helpless far beyond the standards of Europe; and (2) that there runs through Indian society a series of cleavages " of religion, race and caste " which constantly threaten its solidarity.

We admit the existence of these conditions, but we do not admit that they are an effective bar to the beginnings of responsible government even on that scale on which European countries had it when the conditions of life in those countries were no better than they are now in India.

It is said that 226 of 244 millions of people in British India live a rural life: "agriculture is the one great occupation of the people" and "the proportion of these who even give a thought to matters beyond the horizon of their villages is very small." We ask did not similar conditions exist in Great Britain, France and Germany before the inauguration of the Industrial Revolution, and if they did, did they stand in the way of their people getting responsible government or parliamentary institutions? Everyone knows what the conditions in France were in years immediately preceding the Revolution. Italy was no better off in the middle of the nineteenth century. Perhaps it is not much better even today. The masses of the people in these and other countries of Europe, including Great Britain, were far more ignorant, poor and helpless when these countries obtained parliamentary government than they are in India today. And the authors of the report are not unaware that similar concerns are perhaps the main interests of the population of some country districts in the United Kingdom even "today. In several of the Balkan States, Roumania, Serbia and Bulgaria " in Italy and in the component parts of Russia " the conditions are no better, yet their right to autonomous government, nay, even to absolute independence, is hardly questioned. Moreover, as has been pointed out by Mr. Sidney Webb,

> *"It is a mistake to assume that a land of villages necessarily means what is usually implied by the phrase, a people of villagers. In truth, India, for all its villages, has been also, at all known periods, and today still is, perhaps, to a greater extent than ever before, what Anglo-Saxon England, for instance was not or the South African Republic in the days before gold had been discovered, and what the Balkan peninsula even at the present time may perhaps not be, namely a land of flourishing cities, of a distinctly urban civilization, exhibiting not only splendid architecture, and the high development of the manufacturing arts made possible by the concentration of population and wealth,*

but likewise " what is much more important " a secretion of thought, an accumulation of knowledge, and a development of literature and philosophy which are not in the least like the characteristic products of villages as we know them in Europe or America.

And today, although the teeming crowds who throng the narrow lanes of Calcutta or Benares, Bombay or Poona, Madras or Hyderabad, or even the millions who temporarily swarm at Hardwar or Allahabad or Puri may include only at small percentage of the whole population, yet the Indian social order does not seem to be, in the European understanding of the phrase, either on its good or on its bad side, essentially one of the villagers. The distinction may be of importance, because the Local Government developed by peoples of villages, as we know of them in Anglo-Saxon England, in the early days of the South African Republic, and in the Balkan States, is of a very different type from that which takes root and develops, even in the villages, in those nations which have also a City life, centers of religious activity, colleges and universities, and other 'nodal points,' from which emanate, through popular literature, pilgrimages, and the newspaper press, slow but farspreading waves of thought and feeling, and aspirations which it is fatal to ignore."

We have also quoted, in the chapter on " Democracy in India," the statement of Morse Stephens, about the condition of the people of Europe in the eighteenth century.

EDUCATIONAL BACKWARDNESS

"The Educational returns," remark the authors of the Report, "tell us much the same story," viz., the appalling dissimilarity of conditions in Europe and in India. While it is painfully true that the percentage of illiteracy in India is greater than in any of the countries of Europe, we cannot admit that fact is a fatal bar to the beginnings of responsible government in India or to the granting of a democratic constitution to the country. Literacy is, no doubt, a convenient,* but by no means a sure index of the intelligence of the people, even much less' of their character. The political status of a country is determined more by intelligence and character than by literacy. In these the people of India are inferior to none.

By that we do not mean that they are possessed of the same kind of political responsibility as the people of the United Kingdom or of France or of Germany or of the United States, but only that by intelligence and character they are quite fitted to start on the road to responsible government, at least to such kind as was conceded for the first time to Canada, Australia, Italy, • the Balkan States, Austria, Hungary, etc. The illiteracy of the masses may be a good reason for not introducing universal suffrage, but it is hardly a valid reason for refusing a kind of constitution which may place India in the same position, in the matter of responsible Government, as Great Britain, France, Austria- Hungary, Italy and the United States were when those countries showed the same percentage of illiteracy.

Literacy has nowhere been the test of political power. Burma had almost no illiteracy when the British took possession of it; its population was absolutely homogeneous and the solidarity of the nation ran no risk from ''cleavages of religion, race and caste." Even today Burma has the highest figures of literacy in the whole of British India. In that respect it occupies a higher position than Roumania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, many of the Russian States and perhaps even Italy and Hungary and possibly some of the South American Republics. In the matter of race and religion, too, its position is better than that of the countries mentioned, yet the authors of the Report do not propose to concede to it even such beginnings of responsible government as they are prepared to grant to the other provinces of India. The fact is that mere literacy does not play an important part in the awakening of political consciousness in a people. It is a useful ingredient of character required for the exercise of political power but by no means essential.

POVERTY

The argument based on poverty is of still less force. On the other hand, it is the best reason why the people of India should have the power to determine and carry out their fiscal policy. We hope the admissions made in Paragraph 135 of the Report which we bodily reproduce 2 will once for all dispose of the silly statement, so often repeated even by men who ought to } know better, that

materially India has been highly prosperous under British rule. If so, how is it that in the language of the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy "enormous masses of the population have little to spare for more than the necessaries of life"? What about the prosperity of a province, one of the biggest in India (the United Provinces), in which the number of landlords (not tenants and farmers) whose income derived from their proprietary holdings exceeds Â£20 ($100 a year, which comes to 30 cents a day for the whole family), is about 126,000 out of a population of 48 millions!

Acceptance of the argument of poverty as sufficient to deprive people of political right is putting a premium on it which is hardly creditable to the political ethics of the twentieth century. It is the poorest and the most ignorant in the community who most egregiously J suffer at the hands of autocracy. It is they who require protection from it. The wealthy and the educated know how to plight the bureaucrat and get what they want. It is the poor who pay the penalty of political helplessness, yet, curiously, it is for them and in their interest that the English Government in India proposes to withhold the power of the purse from the proposed Indian Councils and insists on denying the Indian people even the elements of | responsible government. While we admit the general justice and accuracy of the observations made under the head of " extent of interest in political questions," "political capacity of the rural population," we fail to see anything in them which justifies the conclusion that the interests of the classes not politically minded will be safer in the hands of the British officer, and on the whole better protected by him than by his educated countrymen who are likely to get the power in case of responsible government being conceded now. In our judgment no greater argument for the immediate grant of a substantial step in the direction of complete responsible government throughout India and in all spheres of government, could be advanced than what is involved in the following observation of the authors of the joint Report: "The rural classes have the greatest stake in the country because they contribute most to its revenues; but they are poorly equipped for politics and do not at present wish to take part in them. Among them are a few great landlords and a larger number

of yeoman farmers. They are not ill-fitted to play a part in affairs, but with few exceptions they have not yet done so. But what is perhaps more important to appreciate than the mere content of political life in India is its rate of growth. No one who has observed Indian life during even the past five years can doubt that the growth is rapid and is real. It is beginning to affect the large landholders: here and there are signs of its beginning to affect even the villages. But recent events, and above all the war, have given it a new earnestness and a more practical character. Men are coming to realise more clearly that India's political future is not to be won merely by fine phrases: and that it depends on the capacity of her people them- selves to face difficulties and to dispose of them. Hence comes the demand for compulsory education, for industries, for tariffs, for social reform, for social, public and even military service."

In the next paragraph, the authors approvingly give an extract from an official report in which it is frankly admitted that the rural population "may not be vocal, but they are certainly not voiceless." The last meeting of the Indian Congress was attended by 700 farmer delegates. Thousands of farmers have joined the Home Rule Leagues. The statement that "hitherto they have regarded the official as their representative in the Councils of the Government" is entirely devoid of any truth. In their eyes the official is the Government itself. Some of them may think that the official represents the Government, but to say that they regard the official as " their representative in the Councils of the Government" is a mere travesty of truth. The paragraph on the " interests of the ryot" bristles with so many unwarranted assumptions that we must enter an emphatic protest against its J misleading nature.

But it gives us pleasure to accord our wholehearted support to the following statement with which the paragraph opens:

> *"It is just because the Indian riot is inarticulate and has not been directly represented in our deliberations that we feel bound to emphasise the great claim he has upon our consideration. The figure of the individual cultivator does not often catch the eye of the Governments in Simla and Whitehall. It is chiefly in the mass that they deal with him, as a consumer of salt or of piece-goods, or unhappily too often as the victim of scarcity or disease."*

It is true that "the district officer and his lieu- tenants" are in a position to know the difficulties that beset the riot and his very human needs. But of what good is this knowledge of the district officer and his lieutenants to him if it has neither provided for the education of his children nor made any provision I for his employment in occupations other than agriculture; nor saved him from the intricacies of the law; nor protected him from the ubiquitous salt tax; nor raised his wages proportionately to the increase of prices; nor yet put him in a position to assert his human rights and to obtain redress for his human, too human, wrongs. If we examine a little more carefully the merits of what is claimed to have been done for him so far by "an official Government," we will find that the claim is by no means established.

We have no desire to deny that among the foreign officers of the British Government in India there are and have been a great many who were genuinely anxious to help the riot and do all which is claimed to have been done for him in this paragraph, but that they have been unable to do anything worth mentioning will be admitted by every right-minded official.

The reasons for their failure were not of their making. The laws of the land made by the British legislators fresh from Court, the spirit of the administration and the system of land taxation have effectively prevented them from doing many of the things which they might otherwise have liked to do. We are sorry that the eminent statesmen responsible for the report should have been the unconscious instruments of producing an entirely wrong impression by the statements in this paragraph. If the statements are true, India must be a veritable paradise and the lot of the Indian ryot enviable. But we know, and the authors of the Report knew it as well, and they have stated in so many words that it is not so. We can quote any number of authorities to show that the Indian ryot is the most pitiable figure in the whole length and breadth of India, if not in the whole world.

This is not the place to quote the easily accessible opinions of eminently qualified and highly trustworthy British writers and administrators on the subject. The English official Government has no doubt professed to do all it claims to have done for the ryot, but how far it has benefited him in these directions is another story. To ask credit for having provided him with a system of law " simple, cheap and certain," or for having established schools and dispensaries within reasonable distance of his residence; or for even having looked after his cattle, by the provision of grazing lands; or for having supplied wood for his implements is to run violently in the face of facts to the contrary. These are verily his principal complaints against British rule. The official Government is certainly entitled to some credit for having started the cooperative credit societies and a few cooperative rural banks for the peasantry, but the reform" To belated and at present plays such an insignificant part in the rural economy of India that it seems hardly worth mentioning or discussing.

But even assuming that the official Government has so far done all that for the ryot, what reason is there to insinuate that the Government of the people will fail to do it for him in the future or will not do it so well as or even better, than has been heretofore done by the bureaucracy? It is quite a gratuitous assumption that in future he will be required to do all these things for himself. Even in the most advanced democracies in the world the peasantry or the masses of the people do not do these things for themselves.

Most of these things are done by officials. The only difference is that in a responsible government the (officials are the servants of the people while in an absolute government they are their masters. We are really surprised at the presumption of the British (bureaucrat, in posing as the special friend of the Indian masses as against their own educated countrymen. The experience of the past does not support the claim and there is absolutely no reason to assume that it will be different in the future. A mere cursory glance at the resolutions of the Indian National Congress passed continuously for a period of thirty years, will show how persistently and earnestly the educated classes have been pleading inter alia for:

(a) compulsory and free education,

(b) for technical instruction in vocations,

(c) for the reduction of the salt tax and the land tax,

(d) for the raising of the minimum incomes liable to income tax,

(e) for the provision of pasture lands,

(f) for the comforts of the third-class railway travelling public,

(g) for the milder administration of the forest laws,

(h) for the reform of the Police, etc.

All these years the bureaucracy did nothing for the ryot and now they pose as his special friends, whose continuance in power and in office is necessary for his protection from the politically minded middle classes. We are a friend neither of the landlord nor of the capitalist. We believe that the ryot and the working men in India as elsewhere are being exploited and robbed by the classes in possession of the means of production and distribution. We would whole- heartedly support any scheme which would open a way to a just and righteous distribution of wealth and land in India and which would insure the ryot and the working man his rightful place in the body politic. We would not mind the aid of the foreign bureaucracy toward that end if we could be sure that the bureaucracy would or could do it. But we have no doubts in the matter that it cannot be done.

The bureaucracy has so far played into the hands of the plutocrat. They have served first their own capitalists and then' the capitalists and landlords of India. Some among them have tried to do a little for the submerged classes, the poor ryot and the ill-paid sweated laborer, but their efforts were of no consequence. They have failed and their failure is writ large on the face of the ryot. We are not sanguine that the politically minded classes when they get power will immediately rehabilitate the ryot and give him his due. We have no hope of that kind. Yet we unhesitatingly support the demand of the politically minded classes for a responsible government in India. In our judgment, that is the only way to raise the masses to a consciousness of their rights and responsibilities. The experience of the West tells us that in that way and in that way alone lies salvation.

Political consciousness must travel from the classes to the masses and the longer the inauguration of popular Government is delayed, the greater the delay in the awakening of the ryot and the working man. Absolutism must first give way and transfer its power to the politically minded classes, then will come the turn

of the masses to demand their rights and compel compliance. We can see risk of a greater harm or injury to the masses of India from the transference of power from the hands of a close bureaucracy of foreigners into the hands of the educated and propertied oligarchy of their own countrymen. Even in countries like Great Britain, America and France it is the educated and the propertied classes who rule. Why then this hubbub about the impropriety and danger of giving power to the same classes in India? Why are the representatives of landlordism and capitalism in the British House of Lords and among the ranks of Imperial Anglo-Indians so solicitous of the welfare of the Indian masses, when (they have for so long persistently denied justice to I the proletariat of their own country? It is a strange phenomenon to see the champions of privilege and status, the defenders of capitalism and landlordism, the advocates of the rights of property, the upholders of caste in Great Britain, spending so much powder and shot to protect the Indian ryot from the prospective exploitation of him by the Indian Brahmin and the Indian Banya (the priest and the capitalist). Let the British Brahmin and the British Banya first begin by doing justice to the proletariat of their own country and then it will be time for them to convince the Indian of their altruism and honesty of purpose in obstructing the inauguration of responsible government in India in the interests of the Indian proletariat. In this connection the authors of the Report make some pertinent observations which deserve to be quoted. After speaking of " religious animosities and social cleavages" and the duty of discouraging them the authors say:

> *"Nor are we without hope that the reforms will themselves help to provide the remedy. We would not be misunderstood. Representative institutions in the West, where all are equal at the ballot box, have checked but not abolished social exclusiveness. We do not make a higher claim for similar institutions in India than that they will help to soften the rigidity of the caste-system. But we hope that these incidents of it which lead to the permanent degradation and ostracism of the lowest castes will tend to disappear in proportion to the acceptance of the ideas on which the new constitution rests. There is a further point. An autocratic administration, which does not share the religious ideas of the people, obviously rinds its sole safe ground in leaving the whole*

department of traditional social usage severely alone. In such matters as child-marriage, it is possible that through excess of caution proper to the regime under which it works, it may be actually perpetuating and stereotyping customs which the better mind of India might be brought, after the necessary period of struggle, to modify. A government, in which Indians themselves participate, invigorated by a closer touch with a more enlightened popular opinion, may be able with all due caution to effect with the free assent or acquiescence of the Indians themselves, what under the present system has to be rigorously set aside."

Nor are the authors unmindful of the effect of free institutions on the character of the people as they themselves over and over again recognise.

"Free institutions have, as we have said, the faculty of reacting on the adverse conditions in which the start has to be made. The backwardness of education may embarrass the experiment at the outset; but it certainly ought not to stop it, because popular government in India as elsewhere is sure to promote the progressive spread of education and so a widening circle of improvement will be set up."

Among the authors' reasons for what they call a gradual advance they state the following also: (a) "We find it freely and widely admitted that they (i.e. the Indians) are not yet ready." This admission may legitimately be used against the total withdrawal of all control of Indian affairs by the Parliament. Firstly, it is questionable whether any such admission is really "freely and widely" made. Secondly, the admission justifies the retention of the powers of vital, general supervision and general control and also the retention of some Europeans in the higher services, but not the total denial of all responsibility for maintaining law and order and of all power to control the central Executive, (b) That the responsibility of India's defence is the ultimate burden which rests on the Government of India; and this duty is the last; which can be entrusted to inexperienced or unskilful hands.

"So long as India depends for her internal and external security upon the army and navy of the United Kingdom, the measure of self-determination which she enjoys must be inevitably limited. We cannot think that Parliament would consent to the employment of British arms in support of a policy over which it had no control and of which it might disapprove. The defence of India is an Imperial question: and for this reason the Government of India must retain both the power and the means of discharging its responsibilities for the defence of the country and to the Empire as a whole."

The defence of India involves, (a) men for the army and the navy, (b) officers, (c) war materials and war ships, (d) experts in strategy, (e) money. That India pays for her defense and also contributes towards the defence of the Empire are facts which cannot be questioned. That she shall continue to do so in the future may also be assumed. That it is extremely desirable that in the matter of war supplies she should be self-dependent has been freely admitted. The permanent Indian army as constituted in pre-war days contained two-thirds Indians and one-third British. If the present strength of the Indian army be examined it will be found that the proportion of British troops is still smaller.

There is absolutely no need of British soldiers in India for the purposes of defence, but if the British Government wants to keep them as safeguards against mutiny among the purely Indian army or against the spirit of rebellion that at any time may exhibit itself among the Indian people, then the British I exchequer must pay for them as it did in the case of I British garrison in South Africa or as the United States does in the case of American troops in the Philippines. It is adding insult to injury to argue that we should not only pay for British troops but that the fact that British troops form a constituent element of the Indian army should be used against us for denying us full responsibility even in civil affairs. The armies of the various Asiatic Governments surrounding India have no European elements in them and the Indian soldier is as efficient a fighter as is needed as a protection.

That the Indian army should be almost exclusively officered by the British is a survival of the policy of mistrust, jealousy and racial discrimination which has hitherto prevailed. It is time that the Indian army should in future be mainly officered by the Indians. Until that is achieved it must continue as a tentative measure to be officered by the British, and the Indian Revenues must bear the burden. But that is hardly any reason for denying

us full responsible government even on the civil side. The Indians do not desire nor demand the transfer of the control over the Army or the Navy until the Army is principally officered by the Indians and an Indian Navy has been built to supplement the Imperial Navy. From this criticism of the reasons advanced by the authors for a very mild " advance " (called " gradual") it is with pleasure that we turn to the brighter side of the picture showing the favorable features of the situation.

"The old assumption that the interests of the ryot must be confided to official hands is strenuously denied by modern educated Indians. They claim that the European official must by his lack of imagination and comparative lack of skill in tongues be gravely handicapped in interpreting the thoughts and desires of an Asiatic people. . . . Our educational policy in the past aimed at satisfying the few, who sought after English education, without sufficient thought of the consequences which might ensue from not taking care to extend instruction to the many. We have in fact created a limited intelligentsia, who desire advance; and we cannot stay their progress entirely until education has been extended to the masses. It has been made a reproach to the educated classes that they have followed too exclusively after one or two pursuits, the law, journalism or school teaching: and that these are all callings which make men inclined to overrate the importance of words and phrases. But even if there is substance in the count, we must take note also how far the past policy of Government is responsible. We have not succeeded in making education practical.

It is only now, when the war has revealed the importance of industry, that we have deliberately set about encouraging Indians to undertake the creation of wealth by industrial enterprise, and have thereby offered the educated classes any tangible inducement to overcome their traditional inclination to look down on practical forms of energy. We must admit that the educated Indian is a creation peculiarly of our own; and if we take the credit that is due to us for his strong points we must admit a similar liability for his weak ones. Let us note also in justice to him that the progressive Indian appears to realise the narrow basis of his position and is beginning to broaden it.

In municipal and university work he has taken a useful and creditable share. We find him organising effort not for political ends alone, but for various forms of public and social service. He has come forward and done valuable work in relieving famine and distress by floods, in keeping order at fairs, in helping pilgrims, and in promoting co-operative credit. Although his ventures in the fields of commerce have not been always fortunate, he is beginning to turn his attention more to the improvement of agriculture and industry. Above all, he is active in promoting education and sanitation; and every increase in the number of educated people adds to his influence and authority."

The authors also say:

"We must remember, too, that the educated Indian has come to the front by hard work; he has seized the education which we offered him because he first saw its advantages; and it is he who has advocated and worked for political progress. All this stands to his credit. For thirty years he has developed in his Congress and latterly in the Muslim League free popular convocations which express his ideals. We owe him sympathy because he has conceived and pur- sued the idea of managing his own affairs, an aim which no Englishman can fail to respect. He has made a skilful, and on the whole a moderate, use of the opportunities which we have given him in the legislative councils of influencing Government and affecting the course of public business, and of recent years, he has by speeches and in the press done much to spread the idea of a united and self-respecting India among thousands who had no such conception in their minds. Helped by the inability of the other classes in India to play a prominent part he has assumed the place of leader; but his authority is by no means universally acknowledged and may in an emergency prove weak."

In face of these observations about the politically minded classes of India it is rather unkind of the authors to insinuate later on that in the interests of the foreign merchant, the foreign missionary and the European servants of the state it is necessary that the Government of India should yet remain absolute and that, in the provinces as well, important branches of the administration should be excluded from the juris- diction of the popular assemblies.

To sum up, while we are prepared to concede that the conditions of the problem may justify the with- holding of absolute autonomy, " political, fiscal, and military, " for some time, there is nothing in them which can in any way be deemed sufficient to deny full political, and, if not complete, at least substantial fiscal autonomy to the Indian people at once.

THE PUBLIC SERVICES IN INDIA

Until now the European servants of the British Government have ruled India quite autocratically. The powers delegated to and the discretion vested in them have been so large that they could do almost anything they liked. They could make or mar the fortunes of millions; they could further their happiness or add to their misery by the simple fiat of their will The only limitation on their power was their own sense of duty and justice. That some of them did let themselves go is no wonder. The wonder is that the instances of unbridled oppression and tyranny were not more numerous than they have actually been. Speaking of the European services generally, we have nothing but admiration for their general character. The particular branch of the Public Services that has been all along entrusted with the general administration of the country is known as the Indian Civil Service. It is recruited in England and is overwhelmingly European in personnel. On April 1 1913, only forty- six of the 1319 civilians on the cadre were natives of India.

Speaking of the executive organizations that have so far ruled India, the eminent authors of the Report for the reorganization of the Government of India remark that it may "well be likened to a mere system of official posts, actuated till now by impulses of its own, but affected by the popular ideas which impinge on it from three sources " the British Parliament, the legislative councils and the local boards." The sentence would have been correct if in place of "but affected" the authors had said "and affected but little." "The system," they add, "has in the main depended for its effectiveness on the experience, wisdom and energy of the services themselves.

It has, for the most part, been represented by the Indian Civil Service which, though having little to do with the technical

departments of government, has for over 100 years in practice had the administration entrusted to its hands, because, with the exception of the offices of the Governor General, Governors, and some members of the executive councils, it has held practically all the places involving superior control. It has been in effect much more of a government corporation than of a purely civil service in the English sense. It has been made a reproach to the Indian Civil Service that it regards itself as the Government; but a view which strikes the critic familiar with parliamentary government as arrogant is little more than a condensed truth."

The Indian Civil Service has thus developed all the characteristics, good and bad, of a caste. It has been a powerful bureaucracy, as exclusive, proud, arrogant and self-sufficient, " if not even more so, " as the original Brahmin oligarchy of the land, except that while the Brahmin oligarchy had ties of race, religion and culture with the rest of the population, the Indian Civil Service is almost entirely composed of aliens. The ancient Brahmins were, however, kept in check by the military caste. The mutual jealousies of these two castes afforded some kind of protection to the people in general. But in the case of the British Indian Civil Service, the military have given entire support to their civilian fellow-countrymen and have been completely under their will.

The Brahmins of India have left a monumental record of their labors. They produced great thinkers, writers, legislators, administrators and organizers. In their own time they were as wise, energetic and resourceful as any bureaucracy in the world has ever been or will ever be. Yet the system of life they devised cut at the roots of national vitality. It dried almost all the springs of corporate national life. It reduced the bulk of the population to a position of complete subservience to their will, of blind faith in their wisdom, of absolute dependence on their initiative. It deprived the common people of all opportunities of independent thought and independent action. It brought about a kind of national atrophy, I And this, in spite of the fact that they began by imposing a rigorous code of self-denial on themselves and their class. For themselves they wanted nothing but a life of poverty and asceticism. Their economic interests were never in theory or in

practice in conflict with those of the rest of the body politic. A Brahmin was forbidden to engage in trade or otherwise accumulate wealth. His life was a life of strict self-abnegation. This cannot be said of the Indian Civil Servant. He receives a handsome salary for his services, expects and receives periodic promotion until he reaches a position which, from an economic point of view, is not unenviable. After retirement he is free to engage in trade and otherwise accumulate wealth. But over and above this, what distinguishes an Indian Civil Servant from an old Brahmin bureaucrat is the fact that in India he represents a nation whose economic interest may not always be in harmony with those of the people of India. He is thus supposed to be the guardian of the interests of his countrymen, and is expected to further them as much as he can without altogether endangering the safety of British rule in India. Looked at from this angle, we have no hesitation in saying that the work of the Indian Civil Service, too, has in its way, been monumental.

As a rule, they have proved capable administrators, individually honest, hardworking and alert. They have organized and tabulated India in a way, perhaps, never done before. But after all has been said in their praise, it cannot be denied that they have done India even more harm than the Brahmin oligarchy in its time, did, by the support they lent to economic exploitation of the country by men of their own race and religion. Now, in this latter respect, we want to guard against being misunderstood. The Indian Civil Service has, in the course of about a century, produced a fairly good number of men who have honestly and fearlessly stood for the protection of Indian interests against those of people of their own race and religion. In doing so they have sometimes ruined their own prospects of promotion and advancement. Whenever they failed in their self-imposed task, and more often they failed than not, they failed because the authorities at the top were forced by considerations of domestic and imperial policy to do otherwise. On the whole, the defects of the bureaucratic administration were more the defects of the system than of the individuals composing it. The Indian Civil Servant, like the old Brahmin, is autocratic and dictatorial. He dislikes any display of independence by the people put under his charge. He discourages initiative. He likes to be called and considered the Mai bap (mother

and father) of his subjects. On those who literally consider him such he showers his favors.

The others he denounces and represses. This has, in the course of time, led to national emasculation. That is our chief complaint against the Indian Civil Service. Of the other services we would rather not speak. They have by no means been so pure and high-minded as the I. C. S., nor perhaps so autocratic and dictatorial. The number of men who misused their powers and opportunities to their own advantage has been much larger in services other than the I. C. S. Yet they all have done a certain amount of good work for India; whether one looks at the engineering works designed and executed by them, or the researches they have made in the science of healing and preventing disease, or the risks they have run in preserving order or maintaining peace one cannot but admire their efficiency and ability. The grievances of the Indian Nationalists against the Public Services in India may be thus summarized:

(a) That the services monopolize too much power and are practically uncontrolled by and irresponsible to the people of the country.

(b) That the higher branches of the services contain too many foreigners.

(c) That these are recruited in England, and from some of them the Indians are altogether barred.

(d) That even when doing the same work Indians are not paid on the same scale as the Europeans.

(e) That the Government has often kept on men of proved inefficiency and of inferior qualities.

(f) That, considering the economic conditions of India, the higher servants of the Government are paid on a scale unparalleled in the history of public administration in the world.

(g) That the interests of the services often supersede those of the country and the Government.

(h) And last, but not least, that by the gathering of all powers of initiative and execution in their hands they have emasculated India.

As regards (a) we have already quoted the opinion of the eminent authors of the report. The principle laid down in the announcement of August 20, and the scheme proposed are supposed to do away with the element of irresponsibility. It is obvious that with the introduction of the principle of popular control into the Government, the power of individual servants of the executive will not remain what it is now, or has been in the past. Much that is vested in and done by the service will be transferred to public bodies elected by popular vote. This will naturally affect (b) and (c) also. We will here stop to quote again from the Report:

"In the forefront of the announcement of August 20 the policy of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration was definitely placed. It has not been necessary for us, nor indeed would it have been possible, to go into this large question in detail in the time available for our inquiry. We have already seen that Lord Hardinge's Government was anxious to increase the number of Indians in the public services, and that a Royal Commission was appointed in 1912 to examine and report on the existing limitations in the employment of Indians. . . . The report was signed only a few months after the outbreak of war, and its publication was deferred in the hope that the war would not be prolonged. When written, it might have satisfied moderate Indian opinion, but when published two years later it was criticised as wholly disappointing. Our inquiry has since given us ample opportunity of .judging the importance which Indian opinion attaches to this question. While we take account of this attitude, a factor which carries more weight with us is that since the report was signed an entirely new policy toward Indian government has been adopted, which must be very largely dependent for success on the extent to which it is found possible to introduce Indians into every branch of the administration."

The authors of the Report then proceed to state the limitations of the process, subject to the general remark that at the present moment there are few Indians (we do not admit this) trained in public life, who can replace the Europeans, and thus to alter the personnel of a service must be a long and steady process. They admit that:

"If responsible government is to be established in India there will be a far greater need than is even dreamt of at present for persons to take part in public affairs in the legislative assemblies and elsewhere; and for this reason the more Indians we can employ in the public services the better. Moreover, it would lessen the burden of Imperial responsibilities if a body of capable Indian administrators could be produced. - We regard it as necessary, therefore, that recruitment of a largely increased proportion of Indians should be begun at once."

In the next paragraph they state why, in their judgment, it is necessary that a substantial portion of the services must continue to be European. Their reasons may be gathered from the following:

"The characteristics which we have learned to associate with the Indian public services must as far as possible be maintained and the leaven of officers possessed of them should be strong enough to assure and develop them in the service as a whole. The qualities of courage, leadership, decision, fixity of purpose, detached judgment and integrity in her public servants will be as necessary as ever to India. There must be no such sudden swamping of any service with

I any new element that its whole character suffers a

I rapid alteration."

On these grounds they make the following recommendations:

"That all distinctions based on race be removed, and that appointments to all branches of the public service be made without racial discrimination" (Para- graph 315).

"II. That for all the public services, for which there is recruitment in England open to Europeans and Indians alike, there must be a system of appointment in India, . . . and we propose to supplement it by fixing a definite percentage of recruitment to be made in India."

"We have not been able to examine the question of the percentage of recruitment to be made in India for any service other than the Indian Civil Service. The Commission recommended that 25 per cent, of the superior posts of that service should be recruited for in India. We consider that changed conditions warrant some increase in that proportion, and we suggest that

33 per cent, of the superior posts should be recruited for in India, and that this percentage should be increased by 11 per cent, annually until the periodic commission is appointed which will re-examine the whole subject. . . . We have dealt only with the Indian Civil Service, but our intention is that there should be in all other services now recruited from England a fixed percentage of recruitment in India, increasing annually.' '

Now we must admit that this is certainly a distinct and marked advance on the existing situation. The Indian Constitutional party, however, wants to have the percentage of recruitment in India fixed at 50 per cent., retaining at the same time the annual increase I suggested. In our opinion, this difference is not material, provided the number of posts to which the rule of percentage is to be applied is substantially reduced. We may state our position briefly.

We are of the opinion that the system of administration in India is much more costly than it should be, considering the sources and the amounts of Indian revenues. Unless the industries of the country are developed we can see no new sources of increased taxation. Consequently, to us, it seems essential that some economy should be effected in the various departments of the administration. The only way to effect that economy is to substantially reduce the number of posts on which it is considered necessary to retain a certain percentage of Europeans. In speaking of the machinery of the Government of India, the authors of the Report say:

"We think we have reason for saying that in some respects the machinery is no longer equal to the needs of the time. The normal work of the departments is heavy. The collective responsibility of the Government is weighty, especially in time of war. There is little time or energy left for those activities of a political nature which the new situation in the country demands. A legislative session of the Government of India imposes a serious strain upon the departments, and especially on the members in charge of them. But apart from the inevitable complexities of the moment, the growing burden of business, which results from the changing political conditions of the country, is leading to an accumulation of questions which cannot be disposed of as quickly as they present themselves. We find the necessity for reforms admitted, principles agreed upon, and decisions taken, and then long delays in giving effect to them. Difficulties are realized, enquiries are started, commissions report, and then there is a pause. There is a belief abroad that assurances given in public pronouncement of policy are sometimes not fulfilled. On this occasion, therefore, we have taken steps to guard against such imputations, and to provide means for ensuring the ordered development of our plans."

PRESENT CAUSES OF DELAY

"The main fault for the clogging of the machine does not, we think, lie altogether with its highly trained engineers. What is chiefly wanted is some change of system in the directions of simplicity and speed. How does it happen that announcements are made that arouse expectations only to defeat them? We know that it is not from any intention of deluding the public. We suggest that it is because the wheels move too slowly for the times; the need for change is realized, but because an examination of details would take too long, promises are made in general terms, which on examination it becomes necessary so to qualify with reservations as to disappoint anticipations, and even to lead to charges of breach of faith. We suspect that a root-cause of some political discontent lies in such delays. Now, so far as the provinces are concerned, we believe that our proposals for freeing them to a great extent from the control of the Government of India and the Secretary of State will improve matters. But the Government of India are in the worst case." These observations raise an apprehension in our mind that it is proposed to add to the strength of the services under the Government of India. We, for ourselves, do not see how it can be otherwise. With the steady admission of the popular element into the Government of India the activities of the latter are likely to increase rather than diminish; the secretarial work of the different departments will expand rather than contract. The question of questions is how to meet the increased cost. The remedy is the same as was suggested many years ago by Sir William Hunter, the official historian of India. He said:

"If we are to give a really efficient administration to India, many services must be paid for at lower rates even at present.

For those rates are regulated in the higher branches of the administration by the cost of officers brought from England. You cannot work with imported labor as cheaply as you can with native labor, and I regard the more extended employment of the natives, not only as an act of justice, but as a financial necessity. If we are to govern the Indian people efficiently and cheaply, we must govern them by means of themselves, and pay for the administration at the market rates for native labor."

Now, whatever may be said about the necessity of maintaining a strong European element in the departments which require initiative, courage, resourcefulness and all the other qualities of "leadership" they are certainly not a sine qua non for efficiency in secretarial work. We can see no reason why, then, the different secretariats of the Government of India cannot be manned mainly, if not exclusively, by Indians. Their salaries need not be the same as those now paid to the Europeans engaged in these departments. May we ask if there is any country on earth where such high salaries are paid to the secretarial heads of departments I as in India? Secretaries to the Government of India in the Army and Public works and Legislative departments receive 42,000 Rs. each ($14,000, or £2800 a year); Secretaries to the Government of India in the Finance, Foreign, Home, Revenue, Agriculture, Commerce and Industry and Education departments get Rs. 48,000 a year each ($16,000 or £3,200) ; Educational Commissioners from 30 to 36,000 Rs. ($10,000 to $12,000).

COST OF ADMINISTRATION

On the subject of the cost of administration it will be instructive to compare the annual salaries allowed to the highest public servants in India, the United States and Japan.

The President of the United States, who ranks with the great royalties of the world in position, gets a salary of $75,000, without any other allowance. The Prime Minister of Japan gets 12,000 yen, or $6000. The Viceroy and the Governor General of India gets 250,000 rupees, or $83,000, besides a very large amount in the shape of various allowances. The Cabinet Ministers of the United States get a salary of $12,000 each, the Japanese 8000 yen or $4000, and the Members of the Viceroy's Council, $26,700 each.

In the whole Federal Government of the United States there are only three offices which carry a salary of more than $8000. They are:

The President of the General Navy Board . . . $13,500

Solicitor General $10,000

Assistant Solicitor General $9,000

All the other salaries range from $2100 to $8000. In the State Department all offices, including those of the secretaries, carry salaries of from $2100 to $5000. In the Treasury Department the Treasurer gets $8000, three other officers having $6000 each. All the remaining officials get from $2500 to $5000. In the War Department there are only two offices which have a salary of $8000 attached: that of Chief of Staff and that of Quartermaster General. The rest get from $2000 to $6000. In the Navy Department, besides the President of the General Board mentioned above, the President of the Naval Examination Board gets $8000 and so does the Commandant of the Marine Corps. All the rest get from $6000 downwards. In the Department of Agriculture there is only one office carrying a salary of $6000. All the rest get from $5000 downwards. The Chief of the Weather Bureau, an expert, gets $6000. In the Commerce Department four experts get $6000 each, the rest from $5000 downwards.

In Japan the officials of the Imperial Household have salaries ranging from $2750 to $4000. Officials of the Higher Civil Service get from $1850 to $2100 a year; the Vice-Minister of State, $2500; Chief of the Legislative Bureau, $2500; the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet, $2500; and the Inspector General of the Metropolitan Police, $2500; President of the Administrative Litigation Court, $3000; President of the Railway Board, $3750; President of the Privy Council, $3000; Vice-President of the Privy Council, $2750, and so on.

When we come to India we find that the President of the Railway Board gets from $20,000 to $24,000 and that two other members of the Railway Board get $16,000. Secretaries in the Army, Public Works, and Legislative Departments get $14,000. Secretaries in Finance, Foreign, Home, Revenue, Agriculture, Commerce and Industry Departments get $16,000. The Secretary

in the Education Department gets $12,000; Joint Secretary, $10,000; Controller and Auditor-General, $14,000; Accountant- General, from $9,000 to $11,000; Commissioner of Salt Revenue, $10,000; Director of Post and Telegraph, from $12,000 to $14,000.

Among the officers directly under the Government of India there are only a few who get salaries below $7000. Most of the others get from that sum up to $12,000.

The United States includes forty-eight States and territories. Some of them are as large in area, if not even larger, than the several provinces of India. The Governors of these States are paid from $2500 to $12,000 a year. Illinois is the only State paying $12,000; five States, including New York and California, pay $10,000; two, Massachusetts and Indiana, pay $8000; one pays $7000, and three pay $6000. All the rest pay $5000 or less. There is only one territory, the Philippines, which pays a salary of $20,000 to its Governor-General.

In India the Governors of Madras, Bombay and Bengal each receive $40,000, besides a large amount for allowances. The Lieutenant-Governors of the Punjab, the United Provinces, Bihar and Burma get $33,000 each, besides allowances. The Chief Commissioners receive $11,000 in Bihar, $18,700 in Assam, $20,700 in the Central Provinces, and $12,000 in Delhi. The Political Residents in the native States receive from $11,000 to $16,000, besides allowances.

In Japan the governors of provinces are paid from $1850 to $2250 per year, besides allowances varying from $200 to $300.

The Provincial services in India are paid on a more lavish scale than anywhere else in the world. In Bengal the salaries range from $1600 for Assistant Magistrate and Collector to $21,333 to Members of the Council, and this same extravagance is also true of the other provinces.

Coming to the Judiciary, we find that Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States get a salary of $14,500 each, the Chief Justice getting $15,000; the Circuit Judges get a salary of $7000 each; the District Judges, $6000. In the State of New York the Judges of the Supreme Court, belonging to the General Sessions, get from $17,500 and those of the Special Sessions from $9000 to

$10,000 each. City Magistrates get from $7000 to $8000. In India the Chief Justice of Bengal gets $24,000; the Chief Justices of Bombay, Madras and the United Provinces, $20,000 each. The Chief Judges of the Chief Court of the Punjab and Burma get $16,000 each and the Puisine Judges of the High Courts the same amounts.

The Puisine Judges of the Chief Courts receive $14,000. In the Province of Bengal the salaries of the District and Session Judges range from $8,000 to $12,000. District Judges of the other provinces get from about $7000 to $12,000. The Deputy Commissioners in India get a salary in the different provinces ranging from $6000 to $9000 a year. The Commissioners get from $10,000 to $12,000.

In Japan the Appeal Court Judges and Procurators get from $900 to $2500 a year. Only one officer, the President of the Court of Causation, gets as much as $3000. The District Court Judges and Procurators are paid at the rate of from $375 to $1850. It is needless to compare the salaries of minor officials in the three countries. Since the Indian taxpayer has to pay so heavily for the European services engaged in the work of administration, it is necessary that even Indian officers should" be paid on a comparatively high scale, thus raising the cost of administration hugely and affecting most injuriously the condition of the men in the lower grades of the government service. The difference between the salaries of the officers and the men forming the rank and file of the government in the three countries shows clearly how the lowest ranks in India suffer from the fact that the highest governmental officials are paid at such high rates.

In New York City the Chief Inspector gets $3500 a year; Captains, $2750; Lieutenants, $2250; Surgeons, $1,750; and Patrolmen, $1,400 each. In Japan the Inspector General of the Metropolitan Police gets $2500. The figures of the lower officials are not available. But the minimum salary of a Constable is $6.50 a month, besides which he gets his equipment, uniform and boots free. In India the Inspectors General get from $8000 to $12,000, the Deputy Inspectors General from $6000 to $7200, District Superintendents of Police from $2666 to $4800, Assistants from $1200 to $2000, Inspectors from $600 to $1000, Sub-inspectors from $200 to $400, Head Constables from $60 to $80, Constables from $40 to $48.

We have taken these figures from the Indian Year Book, published by the Times of India, Bombay. We know as a fact that the Police- Constables in the Punjab are paid from $2.67 to $3.33 per month “ that is, from $32 to $40 per year. The reader should mark the difference between the grades of salaries from the highest to the lowest in India as compared with the United States and Japan. While in India the lowest officials are frightfully underpaid, the highest grades are paid on a lavish scale. In the other countries of the world this is not the case.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT

In the United States (we quote the figures of New York) the lowest grade school teachers get a salary of $720, rising to $1500 a year. In the upper grades salaries range from $1820 to $2260. Principals of elementary schools receive $3500 and assistants $2500. In the High Schools salaries range from $900 to $3150, in training schools from $1000 to $3250. Principals of High Schools and Training Schools receive $5000 and the same salary is paid to the District Superintendent. The Commissioner of Education in New York gets $7500.

In Japan the Minister of Education, who is a Cabinet Minister, gets $4000, and the lowest salaries paid to teachers range from $8 to $9 per month. In the United States College Professors make from $3000 to $5000 per year, a few only getting higher sums. In Japan salaries range from $300 to $2000. Coming to India we find that while the Administrative officials and even the College Professors get fairly high salaries, the teachers in the schools are miserably underpaid. Even the Times of India, an Anglo-Indian newspaper published in Bombay, has recently commented on the colossal difference between the salaries allowed at the top and those allowed at the bottom. Yet recently the Secretary of State has been sanctioning higher leave allowances to the European officers of the Indian Army.

THE INDIAN ARMY AND NAVY

When the Indian troops first arrived in October, 1914, the situation was of so drastic a nature that it was necessary to call upon them at once to re-enforce the fighting front and help to

stem the great German thrust. Their fine fighting qualities, tenacity, and endurance were well manifested during the first Battle of Ypres before they had been able to completely reorganize after their voyage from India.

Lord French, the First Commander- in-Chief of British forces on the Western front.

The full story of the Palestine victory still remained to be told, but when the record OF THAT GLORIOUS CAMPAIGN WAS UNFOLDED, ACROSS THE PAGE OF HISTORY WOULD BE WRIT LARGE THE NAME OF INDIA. As is usual in our history, we have triumphed after many sad blunders and in the end we have defeated Turkey almost single-handed, though our main forces have throughout the war been engaged with another foe. In fact, it is to India that our recent victory is due. . . .

Major General Sir Frederick Maurice in The New York Times, November 6, 19 18.

The present Governor of the Punjab (his precise designation is Lieutenant Governor), who is the most reactionary, self-complacent and conceited of all the provincial rulers of India, has in the course of his appeals for recruits for the present war said more than once that the right of self-government carries with it the responsibility of defending the country. The distinguished authors of the Report have also remarked in one place that so long as the duty of defending India rests on Great Britain, the British Parliament must control the Government of India. Now let us see what the facts are.

The first thing to be remembered in this connection is that during the whole period of British rule in India, not a penny has been spent by Great Britain for Indian defence. The defence of India has been well provided for by Indian Revenues. On the other hand India has paid millions in helping Great Britain not only in defending the Empire, but in extending it. Whatever protection has been afforded to India by the British Navy “ and that has by no means been small “ has been more than repaid by India’s services to the Empire in China, Egypt, South Africa and other parts of the world. As to the military forces of India, they consist of two wings : (a) the British and (b) the Indian. The pre-

war Indian army consisted of 80,000 British and 160,000 Indians. Indian public opinion has for decades been protesting against the denial to Indians of officers' commissions in the Indian army, as also against the strength of the British element therein. Every British unit of the Indian army from the Field Marshal to the Tommy is paid for his services by India. India pays for these services not only during the time they form part of the Indian army but also for their training and equipment. It pays all their leave, transfer and pension charges. It even pays for whatever provision is made in England for their medical relief, etc. In the line of the military and naval defence of India, Great Britain has not done as much for India as she has done for the dominions and self-governing colonies. Under the circumstances it is adding insult to injury to insinuate that India has in any way shirked the duty of providing for her defence. We will say nothing of India's services during the war.

In the military defence of India, the contribution of the Punjab has always been the greatest. If the British provinces are considered singly, it will be found that the Punjab has been supplying the largest number of units for the Indian army, not only in the ranks of the fighters, but also in the ranks of auxiliaries.

During this war, too, the Punjab made the largest contribution of both combatants and non-combatants. Yet, if we compare the civil status of the people of the Punjab with that of other provinces, we will find that they have been persistently denied equality of status ;with Bengal, Bombay and Madras. The Punjab peasantry, which supplies the largest number of soldiers to the army, is the most illiterate and ignorant of all the classes of Indian population. Their economic and legal position may better be studied in Mr. Thorborn's

The Punjab in Peace and in War. The Municipal and Local Boards of the province do not possess as much independence as has been conceded in the other provinces. The judicial administration of the province is as antiquated as it could possibly be under British rule. Instead of a High Court we have still a Chief court Captains and Majors and Colonels are still performing judicial functions as magistrates and judges. The trial by jury in the cases of Indians is unknown.

Until lately the Punjab was stamped with the badge of inferiority by being called a non- Regulation province. Even in this report the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy have spoken of it as a backward province., It will thus be seen that the contribution of the Punjab to the military strength of the Empire has in no way benefited her population in getting better opportunities for civil progress or greater civil liberties. But recently the President of the Punjab Provincial Conference uttered hard words against the Provincial administration's policy of repression and coercion. He said that their "cup of disappointment". So much about the discharge of obligations for military defence carrying with it the right of self- government. The Indians have no desire to shirk their responsibility for the military defence of India; nor do they want to balk their contribution to the Imperial defence. Their demands in this respect may be thus summarised:

(1) That the Indian Army should be mainly officered by the Indians.

(2) That as much as is possible of the arms and ammunition equipment, and the military stores required for the Indian army be produced in India.

(3) That the strength of the British element be considerably reduced.

(4) That the nature of the Indian army, which is at present one of hired soldiers, be converted into that of a National Militia with a small standing army and a great reserve.

(5) That in order to do it, some kind of compulsory military training be introduced. All young men between the ages of 17 and 21 may be required to undergo military training and put in at least one year of military service.

(6) That as a preliminary step towards it the existing Arms Act be repealed and, under proper safeguards, the people be allowed to carry and possess arms in peace and war, so as to be familiar with their use.

(7) That slowly and gradually, as funds can be spared from the other demands more urgent and pressing, an Indian Navy be built.

Having explained the position of the Indian Nationalist in this matter, we will now see what Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford

say on this matter in their report. In Paragraph 328 they state the "Indian wishes" and point out that "for some years Indian politicians have been urging the right of Indians in general to bear arms in defence of their country"; and that "we have everywhere met a general demand from the political leaders for extended opportunities for military service," but that the subject being more or less outside the scope of their enquiry and "requirements of the future" being dependent "on the form of peace which is attained," they "leave this question for consideration hereafter with the note that it must be faced and j settled."

In Paragraph 330 they deal with the question of "British Commissions for Indians."

"The announcement of his Majesty's Government that 'the bar which has hitherto prevented the admission of Indians to commissioned rank in His Majesty's Army should be removed' has established the principle that the Indian soldier can earn the King's commission by his military conduct. It is not enough merely to assert a principle. We must act on it. The services of the Indian army in the war and the great increase in its numbers make it necessary that a considerable number of commissions should now be given. The appointments made so far have been few. Other methods of appointment have not yet been decided on, but we are impressed with the necessity of grappling with the problem. We also wish to establish the principle that if an Indian is enlisted as a private in a British unit of His Majesty's Army its commissioned ranks also should be open to him."

The "other methods of appointment" that have been announced since the report was signed are far from satisfactory. It has been said that the responsibility for this niggardly policy in the matter of admitting Indians to the Commissioned ranks of the army rests with the Home Government and that the Indian Government's recommendations were much more liberal. Now, as practical men, we fully realize that for some time to come, at least until British suspicion of India's desire to get out of the Empire is completely removed by the grant of responsible government to India, India's military policy and the Indian army– must be controlled by the British executive. On that point all the parties in India are agreed. But it is absolutely necessary that some

steps be at once taken to remove the stigma of military helplessness from India's forehead. Let the British retain the control and the command, but let us share the responsibility, to some extent and let our young men be trained for the future defence of their Motherland. To deprive them of all means of doing that, to charge them with neglect of that paramount duty and then to urge it as a disqualification of civil liberties, is hardly fair.

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY IN INDIA

A whole section of the Report has been devoted to a consideration of the claims of the European Community in India. It is said:

"We cannot conclude without taking into due account the presence of a considerable community of non-official Europeans in India. In the main they are engaged in commercial enterprises; but besides these are the missions, European and American, which in furthering education, building up character, and inculcating healthier domestic habits have done work for which India should be grateful. There are also an appreciable number of retired officers and others whose working life has been given to India, settled in the cooler parts of the country. When complaints are rife that European commercial interests are selfish and drain the country of wealth which it ought to retain, it is well to remind ourselves how much of India's material prosperity is due to European commerce."

We have no desire to raise a controversy over the assumption which underlies the last statement in the above extract. The authors are themselves cognizant of it when they remark, later on, that the " benefit " which India has received by her commercial development in European hands is "not less because it was incidental and not the purpose of the undertaking."! These are matters on which the Indian Nationalist may well hold his own opinion and yet endorse the spirit of the following observations:

> *"Clearly it is the duty of British Commerce in India to identify itself with the interests of India, which are higher than the interests of any community; to take part in political life; to use its considerable wealth and opportunities to commend itself to India; and having demonstrated both its value and its good*

intentions, to be content to rest like other industries on the new foundation of Government in the wishes of the people. No less is it the wish of Indian politicians to respect the expectations which have been implicitly held out; to remember how India has profited by commercial development which only British capital and enterprise achieved; to bethink themselves that though the capital invested in private enterprises was not borrowed under any assurance that the existing form of government would endure, yet the favourable terms on which money was obtained for India's development were undoubtedly affected by the fact of British rule; and to abstain from advocating differential treatment aimed not so much at promoting Indian as at injuring British commerce."

We must say that the last insinuation is perfectly gratuitous. Nor is it correct to say even by implication that the non-official European community has hitherto abstained from taking part in politics. The fact is that Indian politics have hitherto been too greatly dominated by the British merchant both at home and in India. The British merchant doing business in India had to submit to the prior claims of the British manufacturers in Great Britain in matters in which their interests did not coincide, but otherwise their interests received the greatest possible attention from the Government of India. In proportion to their incomes derived from India by the employment of Indian labour on terms more or less guaranteed to them by the Indian Government's special legislation they have made the smallest possible contribution to the Indian Revenues; yet they have been the greatest possible hindrance in the development of Indian liberties.

They have all the time owned a powerful press which has employed all the resources of education and enlightenment, all the powers of manipulating facts and figures in maintaining and strengthening the rule of autocracy in the country. We do not propose to open these wounds. But we cannot help remarking that so far they have exercised quite a disproportionate influence in the decisions of the Government of India. Those of them who are domiciled in the country are our brothers and no Indian has the least desire to do anything that will harm them in any way. Their importance must, in future, be determined not by their race

or colour or creed but by their numbers, their education and their position in the economic life of the country. They must no longer lord it over the Indians simply because they are of European descent. They should claim no preferences or exemptions because of that fact. As an integral part of the Indian body politic they are entitled to all the consideration which they deserve by virtue of their intellectual or economic position. They should henceforth be Indo-British both in spirit and in name. They will find the Indians quite ready to forget the past and embrace them as brothers for the common prosperity of their joint country.

As regards the other European merchants who are not domiciled in India but are there just to make money and return to spend it in their native land, they are no more entitled to any place in the political machinery of the Indian Government than the Hindus who trade in the United States or in England. So far every European, of whatever nationality he might be, has occupied a position of privilege in India. He was granted rights which were denied to the sons of the soil. Every German or Austrian or Bulgarian could keep or carry any number and kind of arms he wanted without any license, while the natives of India, even of the highest position, could not do so unless exempted either by virtue of their rank or by the favour of the Administration. Jews and Armenians, Turks and Russians, Scandinavians, Danes Italians and Swiss all enjoyed the privilege.

When charged with any serious offence punishable by imprisonment for more than six months, they could claim trial by a jury having a majority of Europeans on it, while no Indian outside the Presidency towns of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras had that right. Even there, the jury trying an Indian could include a majority of Europeans. In the famous trial of Mr. B. G. Tilak in 1908, the jury was composed of seven Europeans and two Parsees. It is obvious that these discriminations in favour of the Europeans must cease and that no European not domiciled in India should enjoy a position of special privilege. Indians are noted for their hospitality and chivalry. Their own codes of honor effectively prevent them from doing any harm or injury to a foreigner. Every European doing business in India or on any other errand is a guest of honor and entitled to that treatment, provided he does not

assume racial superiority and look down upon the people of the country and take advantage of their being subjects of a European power.

No Indian will be so foolish as to injure the commercial development of his country by scaring the foreign trader or the foreign capitalist. All that he wants is freedom to lay down the terms on which that trade will be carried on consistently with the interests of India's millions. What he stands for is equality and reciprocity. As other peoples are free to name the conditions on which the foreign trader may do business in their countries, so must the Indians be. Nothing more and nothing less than this is demanded.

As regards the citizens of the British Empire also, the same right of reciprocity is demanded. We are glad that the representatives of the Dominions have recognized the justice of that claim and expressed their willingness to concede it.

Coming to the Missions, European and American, the advice given is rather gratuitous. The Indians have left nothing undone to show their gratitude to them for the good work done by them in spite of the fact that they, too, in the past, have not hesitated to use the fact of their race and colour for the benefit of their propaganda. The person of a religious man is sacred in the eyes of an Indian, regardless of his particular creed. The Christian missionary has so far enjoyed a unique position of safety and freedom in the country even to a greater extent than the Hindu or the Moslem priest. The latter have often quarrelled amongst themselves, but the former they have always respected and honored. There is absolutely no reason to think that this is likely to change in any way by the grant of political liberty to the Indians.

It is possible, however, that, with the growth of free thought in India, religious teachers of all denominations may not continue to be the recipients of the same honour as has been paid to them in the past by virtue of their religious office. Dogmatic religion, whether be Hinduism, Mohammedanism or Christianity is in state of decay. In that respect India is feeling the reaction of world forces and no amount of politic coercion or repression can stop it. In my humble judgment the average Indian has thus far been

more tolerant of and more considerate to the Christian missionary than the latter has been to the Indian. Even in the matter of gratitude the Christian missionary may with advantage learn from the Hindu The instances are not rare in which all the hospitality respect and honor which a Christian missionary has received during his stay in India have been repaid by the latter's freely traducing the character of the Indians in his home land. To no small degree is the Christian missionary responsible for the feeling of contempt with which the Indian is looked down upon in America and other countries of the West. We do not object to his speaking the truth, but it is not the truth that he always speaks. Of gratitude, at least, he gives no evidence.

The European Community in India is divided into two classes:

(a) pure Europeans, who number a little less than 200,000 in the total population of 315,000,000. (178,908 in the British provinces and 20,868 in the native States.)

(b) Anglo-Indians, hitherto called Eurasians, who number about 83,000 (68,612 in British territories and 15,045 in the Native States). Thus the whole European community in India is less than 300,000.

THE NATIVE STATES

The Native States of India constitute one of the anomalies of Indian political life. They are the honored remnants of the old order of things an order in which personal bravery, resourcefulness and leadership with or without capacity for successful intrigue enabled individuals to carve out kingdoms and principalities for themselves and their legal successors.

In the case of some of these Native States the genealogies of the ruling houses go back to the early centuries of the Christian era by historical evidence and to pre-Christian times by tradition. Their origin is somewhat shrouded in mystery. In popular belief they are the descendants of gods of light and life, the Sun and the Moon. Next to the Royal family of Japan, they are perhaps the only houses among the rulers of the earth which can claim such an ancient and unbroken lineage of royalty with sovereignty of one kind or another always vested in them. There have been times in their history when the royal heads of these states had no house

to live in and no bed to sleep on, much less a territory to rule and an army to command.

This was, however, a part of their royalty. In struggles against powerful enemies, sometimes of their own race and religion, but more often foreign aggressors of different blood and creed, they were many a time worsted and driven to extreme straits of poverty and helplessness. In peace or in war, in prosperity or in misery, they never gave up the struggle. Their right to lead their people and to rule their country they never yielded for a moment. It is true that sometimes they submitted to the superior power of the enemy and accepted a position of sub ordination, though in one case, at least, even this was done only for a short time under the Moguls. In the darker days of Indian history, when the military devastation of foreign invaders left nothing but tears and blood, ruin and ashes, defeat and misery in their track, these houses kept the lamp of hope burning. For full ten centuries they carried on a struggle of life and death, sometimes momentarily succumbing before the overwhelming force of their adversaries, but only to rise again in fresh vigor and life to reclaim their heritage and preserve their own and their country's independence.

The Sessodias of Mewar called the Ranas of Mewar (Udaipur) and the Rahtores of Marwar (including Jodhpur, Bikaner, Rutlam, Kishangarh and Alwar) have written many a glorious page of Mediaeval Indian history and dyed it with their own blood as well as that of their adversaries. Not only their men but their women have made themselves immortal by their bravery, chivalry, purity and self-immolation. The one thing which distinguishes the Indian Rajput from the peoples of other lands is that he has never waged war against the poor, the helpless and the defenceless.

Numberless men gave their lives freely and ungrudgingly not only in protecting the lives of their own women and children but also in doing the same service to the women and children of their enemies. The Rajput never fought an unfair fight. He never took advantage of the helplessness of his enemy and always gave him right of way and the use of his best weapons for a free and fair fight in the open. Anyone desirous of knowing their deeds may read them in that poem in prose, known as the Annals of Rajhasthan by Col. Todd, Col. Todd has drawn a most faithful and thrilling

picture of Rajput bravery and Rajput chivalry in a language worthy of the best traditions of English literature. Here and there in matters of minor details his authority has been questioned; otherwise the results of his monumental labors still remain the best picture of Rajput India. The Rajput States of India are thus the objects of reverent honor to the 220 million Hindus of that country. Next to the Rajput States comes the native ruling family of Mysore as the representative of a very ancient Hindu Kingdom. The Mahratta States are the remnants of the Mahratta Empire and the Sikhs those of the Sikh Commonwealth. ; The biggest of all the Indian Native States, Hyderabad, arose out of the ruins of the Mogul Empire and is supposed to be the most powerful guardian of Moslem culture and tradition. From this description the reader will at once see why the Native States are so dear to the peoples of India and why the Indian educated party has always stood by the Native States, whenever either their treaty rights or the personal dignity and status of their chiefs was threatened by the British authorities. Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation by lapse was so much resented by the people of India that it had almost cost the British their Indian Empire. Only in the Native States do the Indians see remaining traces of their former independence. That fact alone covers all the defects of; native rule or misrule in the States, in their eyes. Some of these Native States have been so well administered that in education, social reform and industrial advancement they are far ahead of the neighboring British territories. But their chief merit lies in the fact that ordinarily the people get enough food to eat I and are seemingly happier than British subjects. This fact has been noticed by several competent observers of contemporary Indian life, among them the Right Honorable Mr. Fisher, President of the Board of Education in England. In his book The Empire and the Future he has observed:

> *"My impression is that the inhabitants of a well governed native state are on the whole happier and more contented than the inhabitants of British India. They are more lightly taxed; the pace of the administration is less urgent and exacting; their sentiment is gratified by the splendor of a native court and by the dominion of an Indian government. They feel that they do things for themselves instead of having everything done for them by a cold and alien benevolence."*

But after all that is favourable to the Native States of India has been said, their existence in their present form remains a political anomaly. As at present (situated, they are an effective hindrance to complete Indian unity. Although " India is in fact as well as by legal definition, one geographical whole," yet these Native States, occupying about one-third of the total area of the country and with a population of about 70 million will, for a long time, prevent its becoming a homogeneous political whole. Thus a circumstance which was hitherto looked upon as a piece of good luck will operate as a misfortune.

"The Native States of India are about 700 in number. They embrace the widest variety of country and jurisdiction. They vary in size from petty States like Rewa, in Rajputana, with an area of 19 square miles, and the Simla Hill States, which are little more than small holdings, to States like Hyderabad, as large as Italy, with a population of thirteen millions."

The general position as regards the rights and obligations of the Native States has been thus summed up by the distinguished authors of the joint Report (Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu):

"The States are guaranteed security from without; the paramount power acts for them in relation to foreign powers and other States, and it intervenes when the internal peace of their territories is seriously threatened. On the other hand the States' relations to foreign powers are those of the paramount power; they share the obligation for the common defence; and they are under a general responsibility for the good government and welfare of their territories. "

As regards the assimilation of the principles of modern life, it is remarked in the same document:

"Many of them have adopted our civil and criminal codes. Some have imitated and even further extended our educational system. . . . They have not all been equally able to assimilate new principles. They are in all stages of development, patriarchal, feudal or more advanced, while in a few states are found the beginnings of representative institutions. The characteristic features of all of them, however, including the most advanced, are the- personal rule of ¢ the Prince and his control over legislation and the administration of justice. "

Under the circumstances the question of questions is how these territories are going to fall into line with the British controlled area in the matter of the development of responsible Government. We will once more quote the opinion of the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy, who say:

"We know that the States cannot be unaffected by constitutional development in adjoining provinces. Some of the more enlightened and thoughtful of the Princes, among whom are included some of the best known names, have realised this truth, and have them- selves raised the question of their own share in any scheme of reform. Others of the Princes " again including some of the most honored names " desire only to leave matters as they are. We feel the need for caution in this matter. It would be a strange reward for loyalty and devotion to force new ideas upon those who did not desire them; but it would be no less strange, if out of consideration for those who perhaps represent gradually vanishing ideas, we were to refuse to consider the suggestions of others who have been no less loyal and devoted. Looking ahead to the future we can picture India to ourselves only as presenting the external semblance to some form of 'federation.'

The provinces will ultimately become self-governing units, held together by the central Government which will deal solely with matters of common concern to all of them. But the matters common to the British provinces are also to a great extent those in which the Native States are interested " defence, tariffs, exchange, opium, salt, railways and posts and telegraphs. The gradual concentration of the Government of India upon such matters will therefore make it easier for the States, while retaining the autonomy which the}' cherish in internal matters, to enter into closer association with the central Government if they wish to do so. But though we have no hesitation in forecasting such a development as possible, the last thing that we desire is to attempt to force the pace. Influences are at work which need no artificial stimulation. All that we need or can do is to open the door to the natural developments of the future."

In Paragraphs 302 to 305 the authors of the Report state the process by which this development may be expedited. Disavowing

any intention of forcibly altering treaty rights, they propose to classify the States into (a) those that have "full authority over their internal affairs," (b) those "in which Government exercises through its Agents large powers of internal control," (c) those who are really no more "than mere owners of a few acres of land." It is further pointed out that hitherto the general clause which occurs in many of the treaties to the effect that the Chief shall remain absolute Ruler of his country has not in the past precluded and does not even now preclude ' interference with the administration by Government through the agency of its representatives at the Native Courts.' We need hardly say that such interference has not been employed in wanton disregard of treaty obligations. During the earlier days of our intimate relations with the States British agents found themselves compelled, often against their will, to assume responsibility for the welfare of the people, to restore order out of chaos, to prevent inhuman practices, and to guide the hands of a weak or incompetent Ruler as the only alternative to the termination of his rule. So too, at the present day, the Government of India acknowledges as trustee, a responsibility (which the Princes themselves desire to maintain) for the proper administration of States during a minority, and also an obligation for the prevention or correction of flagrant misgovernment."

And also that:

"the position hitherto taken up by Government has been that the conditions under which some of the treaties were executed have undergone material changes, and the literal fulfilment of particular obligations which they impose has become impracticable. Practice has been based on the theory that treaties must be read as a whole, and that they must be interpreted in the light of the relation established between the parties not only at the time when a particular treaty was made, but subsequently."

On these grounds it is proposed to establish a Council of Princes to which questions which affect the States generally or are of concern to the Empire as a whole, or to British India and the States in common, may be referred for advice and opinion. So long as the Princes do not intervene either formally or informally in the internal affairs of British India, we have no objection to the scheme. On the other hand, we do hope some method will be

found by which, with the consent of the parties interested the smaller principalities scattered all over the country may, for administrative purposes, be merged either in the British area or in the bigger Native States which possess full power of autonomy over their internal affairs. In the long run it will be comparatively easy to convert the latter to an acceptance of the modern principles of government if the number of Native States is reduced and their people achieve that solidarity which comes by community of interests and ideas.

In this connection it is a happy augury for the future that some of the highest Chiefs like those of Mysore, Baroda, Gwaliar, Indore, Kashmir, Bikaner, Jodhpore, Alwar, and Patiala are alive to the importance of marching with the times. The people of British India owe them a great debt of gratitude for the moral support they have given to their claim for responsible Government by coming out openly and freely in favour of the proposed advance. We are sure that these Princes will in due time take measures to bring their own territories in line with the British provinces and thus strengthen the ties that bind them to their own peoples as well as to the other people of India. After all, there can be no manner of doubt, as the authors of the report predict, "that the processes at work in British India cannot leave the States untouched and must in time affect even those whose ideas and institutions are of the most conservative and feudal character."

It is the path of wisdom and sagacity to recognise the world forces that are at work. No amount of ancient prestige can prevent the people from coming into their own. The age of despotism is gone and the autocrats of today must sooner or later hand over their powers to the people. The more they conciliate them the longer perhaps they may be able to lead them. They may continue as leaders for a long time, but as autocratic dispensers of favours and fortunes they cannot remain, perhaps not even for their life time.

In our judgment this part of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report is no less important for the future of Indian democracy than the others that directly deal with British India, and we hope that whatever might be the policy as regards the existing States the new law will make it impossible for the Government of India ;

and the Secretary of State to create any new States in the future. It is monstrous to transfer millions of ' human beings from one kind of political rule to another like so many cattle, as was done in iqii. The present rule of any Indian Maharaja may be as good or as bad as that of a British Governor or Lieutenant Governor, but the latter has in it greater democratic potentialities than the former, for the mere fact, if for no other, that, while the British are more or less amenable to world opinion, the rulers of Native States are not. It is inhuman, and not in accord with modern ideas of right and wrong to reward somebody's loyalty by giving him power of life and death over numerous fellow beings, otherwise than in due course of law. Even the mighty British Government is not the owner of the bodies and souls of its subjects in India. How, then, can it assume the right of abandoning them to the absolute rule of a single individual, however worthy or loyal he may be? We hope this stupid way of rewarding loyal services may be ended by an express provision to that effect in the statute which will be passed relating to the reorganization of the Government of India. In this connection the following observations made in a leading editorial of the Servant of India, Poona (February 16, 1919), are worthy of attention:

> *"A hundred years ago, it was decidedly in the interests of British rule, and probably also in the interests of the people of India generally, that the small, ill-governed, and eternally fighting states of India should come under the suzerainty of a single powerful power. It may be regarded as a historical misfortune that this power happened then to be foreign, though many regard this contact with a virile civilization as the making of India. This suzerainty could then be established duly by entering into treaties with these states and guaranteeing them certain rights and privileges. But these treaties have now assumed in the eyes of the descendants of the original princes an air of inspiration; they have become a kind of perpetuity. They always come in the way of any improvement. When any new policy is proposed to them, they are always prepared to say, 'This is not in the bond.' One may be allowed to speculate as to how many of these Highnesses would have survived to this day to put forward this claim in the absence of the suzerain power.*

> *Thrones in ancient days were as unstable as they are becoming now in Europe. It is hardly possible that the present popular wave in Europe would not have touched our Native States. The subjects of the states would have clamoured for a recognition of their rights, and they would have had their way. But now the princes feel quite secure. Have they not got their treaties? As a result there is no political life at all in the Native States. The most ardent advocate of Home Rule would be most violently against migration to a Native State. The real problem of the Native States is how to get over the treaties when they conflict with the interests of their subjects. The questions discussed at the Chiefs' Conference leave us comparatively cold, as they entirely neglect the people most concerned. The questions of the rights of the chiefs and their salutes or precedence are in our opinion of a very secondary importance.*
>
> *A renowned statesman in Europe gave at the utmost a life of a dozen years to the most solemn treaty between two countries, for in that period circumstances alter and the solid foundation for the treaty cracks. Is it not high time that the treaties with the chiefs should be revised after over a hundred years? It 'would indeed redound to their credit if the chiefs them- selves come forward to submit to such readjustment. Perhaps their autocratic and irresponsible power may*' have to suffer some diminution. But if they consent to that diminution so as to give it to their subjects in the modern democratic spirit, the real power and influence of the Native States will increase incalculably. It is in this direction we wish to see a solution of the problem of the Native States which are nowadays working as a brake on our national progress."*

THE PROPOSALS

Part II of the Report contains the scheme which Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford propose for the solution of the problem which they had set themselves to solve in Part I. In giving their reasons for a new policy they observe:

> *"No further development (on old lines) is possible unless we are going to give the people of India some responsibility for their own government. But no one can imagine that no further*

development is necessary. It is evident that the present machinery of government no longer meets the needs of the time; it works slowly and it produces irritation; there is a widespread demand on the part of educated Indian opinion for its alteration; and the need for advance is recognised by official opinion also."

The new policy sketched by them is, in their judgment, "the logical outcome of the past. Indians must be enabled, in so far as they attain responsibility, to determine for themselves what they want done"... such limitations on powers as we are now proposing are due only to the obvious fact that time is necessary in order to train both representatives and electorates for the work which we desire them to undertake; and that we offer Indians opportunities at, short intervals to prove the progress they are making and to make good their claim, not by the method of agitation but by positive demonstration, to the further stages in self-government which we have just indicated."

That is the only basis on which they maintain they can hope to see in India "the growth of a conscious feeling of organic unity with the Empire as a whole." With these and a few more prefatory remarks about the educational problem and the attitude of the ryot and the enunciation of the general principles on which their proposals are based they proceed to formulate their scheme, starting first with the provinces.

The proposals relating to Provincial Government may be noticed under the following heads:

(a) *Financial Devolution:* It is proposed that hence- forth there should be a complete separation of the provincial finances from those of the Government of India; that, reserving certain sources of revenue for the Government of India, all others should be made over to the Provincial Governments with the proviso that the first charge on all Provincial revenues will be a contribution towards the maintenance of the Government of India, considered necessary and demanded by the latter. A certain amount of power to impose fresh taxes and to raise loans is also conceded to the provincial Governments subject to the veto of the Government of India.

(b) *Legislative Devolution:* "It is our intention,'' say the authors of the report, "to reserve to the Government of India a general overriding power of legislation for the discharge of all functions which it will have to perform. It should be enabled under this power to intervene in any province for the protection and enforcement of the interests for which it is responsible; to legislate on any provincial matter in respect of which uniformity of legislation is desirable, either for the whole of India or for any two or more provinces; and to pass legislation which may be adopted either simpliciter or with modifications by any province which may wish to make use of it. We think that the Government of India must be the sole judge of the propriety of any legislation which it may undertake under any one of these categories, and that its competence so to legislate should not be open to challenge in the courts. Subject to these reservations we intend that within the field which may be marked off for provincial legislative control the sole legislative power shall rest with the provincial legislatures." It is not proposed to put a statutory limitation on the power of the Government of India to legislate for the provinces, but it is hoped that "constitutional practice " will prevent the central Government interfering in provincial matters unless the interests for which the latter is responsible are directly affected.

(c) *Provincial Executive:* Article 220 gives the Governor the power to appoint "one or two additional members of his Government as members without portfolio for purposes of consultation and advice."

These, in substance, are the proposals of the Secretary of State and the Government of India for the future government of the provinces into which India is divided. Some of these latter and some other tracts are expressly excluded from the operation of these recommendations. It will be at once observed that this is neither autonomy nor home rule. It is a kind of hybrid system with final powers of veto and control vested in the Government of India. The provision as to Provincial Legislatures make it still more complicated.

"Let us now explain how we contemplate in future that the executive Governments of the provinces shall be constituted. As we have seen, three provinces are now governed by a Governor and an Executive Council of three members, of whom one is in practice an Indian and two are usually appointed from the Indian Civil Service, although the law says only that they must be qualified by twelve years' service under the Crown in India. One province, Bihar and Orissa, is administered by a Lieutenant-Governor with a council of three constituted in the same way. The remaining five provinces, that is to say, the three Lieutenant-Governorships of the United Provinces, the Punjab and Burma and the Chief Commissioner- ships of the Central Provinces and Assam are under the administration of a single official Head. We find throughout India a very general desire for the extension of Council government. . . . Our first proposition, therefore, is that in all these provinces singleheaded administration must cease and be re- placed by collective administration.

"In determining the structure of the Executive we have to bear in mind the duties with which it will be charged. We start with the two postulates; the complete responsibility for the government cannot be given immediately without inviting a breakdown, and that some responsibility must be given at once if our scheme is to have any value. We have defined responsibility as consisting primarily in amenability to constituents, and in the second place in amenability to an assembly. We do not believe that there is any way of satisfying these governing conditions other than by making a division of the functions of the Government, between those which may be made over to popular control and those which for the present must remain in official hands. . . . We may call these the 'reserved' and ' transferred' subjects respectively. It then follows that for the management of these two categories there must be some form of executive body, with a legislative organ in harmony with it. . . .

"We propose therefore that in each province the executive Government should consist of two parts. One part would comprise the head of the province and an executive council of two members. In all provinces the head of the Government would be known as Governor. . . . One of the two Executive

Councilors would in practice be a European qualified by long official experience, and the other would be an Indian. It has been urged that the latter should be an elected member of the provincial legislative council. It is unreasonable that choice should be so limited. It should be open to the Governor to recommend whom he wishes. . . . The Governor in council would have charge of the reserved subjects. The other part of the government would consist of one member or more than one member, according to the number and importance of the transferred subjects, chosen by the Governor from the elected members of the Legislative council. They would be known as ministers. They would be members of the executive Government but not members of the Executive Council; they would be appointed for the life-time of the legislative council, and if reelected to that body would be re-eligible for appointment as members of the Executive. As we have said, they would not hold office at the will of the legislature but at that of their constituents.

"The portfolios dealing with the transferred subjects would be committed to the ministers, and on these subjects the ministers together with the Governor would form the administration. On such subjects their decision would be final, subject only to the Governor's advice and control. We do not con- template that from the outset the Governor should occupy the position of a purely constitutional Governor who is bound to accept the decisions of his ministers. "

(d) *Provincial Legislatures:* "We propose there shall be in each province an enlarged legislative council, differing in size and composition from province to province, with a substantial elected majority, elected by direct election on a broad franchise, with such communal and special representation as may be necessary."

The questions of franchise and special and communal representation have been entrusted to a special committee the report of which is shortly expected. The same committee will also decide how many official members there will be on each Legislative Council. It is provided that the Governor shall be the President of the Council and will have the power to nominate a Vice-president from the official members. As to the effect of resolutions

it is said that "we do not propose that resolutions, whether on reserved or transferred subjects should be binding."

The classification of the reserved and transferred subjects was also left to a special committee which has since concluded its labours and whose report is awaited with interest.

Legislation on reserved subjects:

"For the purpose of enabling the provincial Government to get through its legislation on reserved subjects, we propose that the head of the Government should have power to certify that a Bill dealing with a reserved subject is a measure 'essential to the discharge of his responsibility for the peace or tranquility of the province or of any part thereof, or for the discharge of his responsibility for the reserved subjects.' . . . The Bill will be read and its general principles discussed in the full legislative council. It will at this stage be open to the council by a majority vote to request the Governor to refer to the Government of India, whose decision on the point shall be final, on the question whether the certified Bill deals with a reserved subject. If no such reference is made, or if the Government of India decide that the certificate has been properly given, the Bill will then be automatically referred to a Grand Committee of the council. Its composition should reproduce as nearly as possible the proportion of the various elements in the larger body. . . . the grand committee in every council should be constituted so as to comprise from 40 to 50 per cent, of its strength. It should be chosen for each Bill, partly by election by ballot, and partly by nomination. The Governor should have power to nominate a bare majority exclusive of himself. Of the members so nominated not more than two- thirds should be officials, and the elected element should be elected ad hoc by the elected members of the council on the system of the transferable vote."

"On reference to the grand committee, the Bill will be debated by that body in the ordinary course, if necessary referred to a select committee, to which body we think that the grand committee should have power to appoint any member of the legislative council whether a member of the grand committee or not. The select committee will, as at present, have power to take evidence. Then, after being debated in the grand committee

and modified as may be determined, the Bill will be reported to the whole council. The council will have the right to discuss the Bill again generally, but will not be able to reject it, or to amend it except on the motion of a member of the executive council. The Governor will then appoint a time limit within which the Bill may be debated in the council, and on its expiry it will pass automatically. But during such discussion the council will have the right to pass a resolution recording any objection which refers to the principle or details of the measure (but not, of course, to the certificate of its character), and any such resolution will accompany the Act when, after being signed by the Governor, it is submitted to the Governor General and the Secretary of State."

Provincial Budget: . . . the provincial budget should be framed by the executive Government as a whole. The first charge on provincial revenues will be the contribution to the Government of India; and after that the supply for the reserved subjects will have priority. The allocation of supply for the transferred subjects will be decided by the ministers. If the revenue is insufficient for their needs, the question of new taxation will be decided by the Governor and the ministers. We are bound to recognise that in time new taxation will be necessary, for no conceivable economies can finance the new developments which are to be anticipated. The budget will then be laid before the council which will discuss it and vote by resolution upon the allotments. If the legislative council rejects or modifies the proposed allotment for' reserved subjects, the Governor should have power to insist on the whole or any part of the allotment originally provided, if for reasons to be stated he certifies its necessity in the terms which we have already- suggested. We are emphatically of opinion that the Governor in Council must be empowered to obtain the supply which he declares to be necessary for the discharge of his responsibilities. Except in so far as the Governor exercises this power the budget would be altered in accordance with the resolutions carried in council. "

Modification of the Scheme by the Government of India. "After five years time from the first meeting of the reformed councils we suggest that the Government of India should hear applications

from either the provincial Government or the provincial council for the modification of the reserved and transferred lists of the province; and that, after considering the evidence laid before them, they should recommend for the approval of the Secretary of State the transfer of such further subjects to the transferred list as they think desirable. On the other hand, if it should be made plain to them that certain functions have been seriously maladministered, it will be open to them, with the sanction of the Secretary of State, to retransfer subjects from the transferred to the reserved list, or to place restrictions for the future on the minister's powers in respect of certain transferred subjects. . . . But it is also desirable to complete the responsibility of the ministers for the transferred subjects. This should come in one of two ways, either at the initiative of the council if it desires and is prepared to exercise greater control over the ministers, or at the discretion of the Government of India, which may wish to make this change as a condition of the grant of new, or of the maintenance of existing, powers. We propose, therefore, that the Government of India may, when hearing such applications, direct that the ministers' salaries, instead of any longer being treated as a reserved subject, and, therefore, protected in the last resort by the Governor's order from interference should be specifically voted each year by the legislative council; or, failing such direction by the Government of India, it should be open to the councils at that time or subsequently to demand by resolution that such ministers' salaries should be so voted, and the Government of India should thereupon give effect to such request."

Periodic commissions: . . . Ten years after the first meeting of the new councils established under the Statute a commission should be appointed to review the position. Criticism has been expressed in the past of the composition of Royal Commissions, and it is our intention that the commission which we suggest should be regarded as authoritative and should derive its authority from Parliament itself. The names of the commissioners, therefore, should be submitted by the Secretary of State to both Houses of Parliament for approval by resolution. The commissioners' mandate should be to consider whether by the end of the term of the legislature then in existence it would be possible to establish complete responsible government in any province or provinces,

or how far it would be possible to approximate it in others; to advise on the continued reservation of any departments for the transfer of which to popular control it has been proved to their satisfaction that the time had not yet come; to recommend the retransfer of other matters to the control of the Governor in Council if serious maladministration were established; and to make any recommendations for the working of responsible government or the improvement of the constitutional machinery which experience of the systems in operation may show to be desirable. . . .

" There are several other important matters, germane in greater or less degree to our main purpose, which the commission should review. They should investigate the progress made in admitting Indians into the higher ranks of the public service. They should examine the apportionment of the financial burden of India with a view to adjusting it more fairly between the provinces. The commission should also examine the development of education among the people and the progress and working of local self-governing bodies. Lastly the commission should consider the working of the franchise and the constitution of electorates, including the important matter of the retention of communal representation. Indeed, we regard the development of a broad franchise as the arch on which the edifice of self-government must be raised; for we have no intention that our reforms should result merely in the transfer of powers from a bureaucracy to an oligarchy. . . ."

"In proposing the appointment of a commission ten years after the new Act takes effect we wish to guard against possible misunderstanding. We would not be taken as implying that there can be established by that time complete responsible government in the provinces. In many of the provinces no such con- summation can follow in the time named. The pace will be everywhere unequal, though progress in one province will always stimulate progress elsewhere; but undue expectations might be aroused, if we indicated any opinion as to the degree of approximation to complete self-government that might be reached even in one or two of the most advanced provinces. The reasons that make complete responsibility at present impossible are likely to continue operative in some degree even after a decade." The proposals regarding the

Government of India called the Central Government may be thus summed up:

(a) *General:* "We have already made our opinion clear that pending the development of responsible government in the provinces the Government of India must remain responsible only to Parliament. In other words, in all matters which it judges to be essential to the discharge of its responsibilities for peace, order, and good government it must, saving only for its accountability to Parliament, retain indisputable power. "

(b) *The Governor General's Executive Council:* "We would therefore abolish such statutory restrictions as now exist in respect of the appointment of Members of the Governor General's Council, so as to give greater elasticity both in respect to the size of the Government and the distribution of work."

At present there is one Indian member in the Viceroy's Executive Council consisting of six ordinary members and one extraordinary besides the Viceroy. This scheme recommends the appointment of another Indian.

(c) The Indian Legislative Council.

I. Legislative Assembly: " We recommend therefore that the strength of the legislative council, to be known in future as the Legislative Assembly of India, should be raised to a total strength of about 100 members, so as to be far more truly representative of British India. We propose that two-thirds of this total should be returned by election; and that one- third should be nominated by the Governor General, of which third not less than a third again should be non-officials selected with the object of representing minority or special interests. . . . Some special representation, we think, there must be, as for European and Indian commerce, and also for the large landlords. There should be also communal representation for Muhammadans in most provinces and also for Sikhs in the Punjab."

II. The Council of State: "We do not propose to institute a complete bi-cameral system, but to create a second

chamber, known as the Council of State, which shall take its part in ordinary legislative business and shall be the final legislative authority in matters which the government regards as essential. The Council of State will be composed of 50 members, exclusive of the Governor General, who would be President, with power to appoint a Vice-President who would normally take his place: not more than 25 will be officials, including the members of the executive council, and 4 would be non-officials nominated by the Governor General. Official members would be eligible for nomination to both the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State. There would be 21 elected members of whom 15 will be returned by the non- official members of the provincial legislative councils, each council returning two members, other than those of Burma, the Central Provinces and Assam which will return one member each. . . .

"Inasmuch as the Council of State will be the supreme legislative authority for India on all crucial questions and also the revising authority upon all Indian legislation, we desire to attract to it the services of the best men available in the country. We desire that the Council of State should develop something of the experience and dignity of a body of Elder States- men; and we suggest therefore that the Governor General in Council should make regulations as to the qualification of candidates for election to that body which will ensure that their status and position and record of services will give to the Council a senatorial character, and the qualities usually regarded as appropriate to a revising chamber."

III. Legislative procedure: "Let us now explain how this legislative machinery will work. It will make for clearness to deal separately with Government Bills and Bills introduced by non-official members. A Government Bill will ordinarily be introduced and carried through all the usual stages in the Legislative

Assembly. It will then go in the ordinary course to the Council of State, and if there amended in any way which the Assembly is not willing to accept, it will be submitted to a joint session of both Houses, by whose decision its ultimate fate will be decided. This will be the ordinary course of legislation. But it might well happen that amendments made by the Council of State were such as to be essential in the view of the Government if the purpose with which the Bill was originally introduced was to be achieved, and in this case the Governor General in Council would certify that the amendments were essential to the interests of peace, order, or good government. The assembly would then not have power to reject or modify these amendments, nor would they be open to revision in a joint session.

"We have to provide for two other possibilities. Cases may occur in which the Legislative Assembly refuses leave to the introduction of a Bill or throws out a Bill which the Government regarded as necessary. For such a contingency we would provide that if leave to introduce a Government Bill is refused, or if the Bill is thrown out at any stage, the Government should have the power, on the certificate of the Governor General in Council that the Bill is essential to the interests of peace, order, or good government, to refer it de novo to the Council of State; and if the Bill, after being taken in all its stages through the Council of State, was passed by that body, it would become law without further reference to the Assembly. Further, there may be cases when the consideration of a measure by both chambers would take too long if the emergency which called for the measure is to be met. Such a contingency should rarely arise; but we advise that in cases of emergency, so certified by the Governor General in Council, it should be open to the Government to introduce a Bill in the Council of State, and upon its being passed there merely to report it to the Assembly."

IV. Powers of dissolution, etc.: "The Governor General should in our opinion have power at any time to dissolve either the Legislative Assembly or the Council of State or both these bodies. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the Governor General and the Secretary of State should retain their existing powers of assent, reservation, and disallowance to all Acts of the Indian legislature. The present powers of the Governor General in Council under section 71 of the Government of India Act. 191 5, to make regulations proposed by local Governments for the peace and good government of backward tracts of territory should also be preserved; with the modification that it will in future rest with the Head of the province concerned to propose such regulations to the Government of India."

V. Fiscal legislation: " Fiscal legislation will, of course, be subject to the procedure which we have recommended in respect of Government Bills. The budget will be introduced in the Legislative Assembly but the Assembly will not vote it. Resolutions upon budget matters and upon all other questions, whether moved in the Assembly or in the Council of State, will continue to be advisory in character."

(d) *Privy Council:* "We have a further recommendation to make. We would ask that His Majesty may be graciously pleased to approve the institution of a Privy Council for India. ... The Privy Council's office would be to advise the Governor General when he saw fit to consult it on questions of policy and administration."

(e) *Periodic Commissions:* "At the end of the last chapter we recommended that ten years after the institution of our reforms, and again at intervals of twelve years thereafter, a commission approved by Parliament should investigate the working of the changes introduced into the provinces, and recommend as to their further progress. It should be equally the duty of the commission to examine and report upon the new constitution of the Government of India, with particular reference to the working of the machinery for representation, the procedure by certificate, and the results of joint sessions."

India Office in London

The principal proposals under this head may be thus summarized;

> *"We advise that the Secretary of State's salary, like that of all other Ministers of the Crown, should be defrayed from home revenues and voted annually by Parliament. This will enable any live questions of Indian administration to be discussed by the House of Commons in Committee of Supply. ... It might be thought to follow that the whole charges of the India Office establishment should similarly be transferred to the home Exchequer; but this matter is complicated by a series of past transactions, and by the amount of agency work which the India Office does on behalf of the Government of India; and we advise that our proposed committee upon the India Office organization should examine it and taking these factors into consideration, determine which of the various India Office charges should be so transferred, and which can legitimately be retained as a burden on Indian revenues.*
>
> *"But the transfer of charges which we propose, although it will give reality to the debates on Indian affairs, will not ensure in Parliament a better informed or a more sustained interest in India. We feel that this result can only be accomplished by appointing a Select Committee of Parliament on Indian affairs."*

The above in substance is the proposed scheme. In India it has met with varied response. The European community does not approve of it. They think it is too radical. The European Services have struck a note of rebellion threatening to resign in case of its acceptance by Parliament. The Indian politicians are divided into two camps. Their views are best represented by the following tabular statement which we reproduce from the Indian newspapers.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO THE REFORM PROPOSALS PASSED

Ordinary Rights of Citizens

By the Special Congress Resolution IV. The Government of India shall have undivided administrative authority on matters

directly concerning peace, tranquillity and defence of the country subject to the following:

That the Statute to be passed by Parliament should include the Declaration of the Rights of the people of India as British citizens:

(a) That all Indian subjects of his Majesty and all the subjects naturalized or resident in India are equal before the law, and there shall be no penal nor administrative law in force in the country whether substantive or procedural of a discriminative nature.

(b) That no Indian subject of his Majesty shall be liable to suffer in liberty, life, property or of association, free speech or in respect of writing, except under sentence by an ordinary Court of Justice, and as a result of a lawful and open trial.

(c) That every Indian subject shall be entitled to bear arms, subject to the purchase of a licence, as in Great Britain, and that the right shall not be taken away save by a sentence of an ordinary Court of Justice.

By the Moderate Conference

This Conference urges that legislation of an exceptional character having the effect of curtailing ordinary rights such as the freedom of the press and public meetings and open judicial trial, should not be carried through the Council of State alone, or in spite of the declared opinion of the Legislative Assembly of India, except in a time of war or internal disturbance, without the approval of the Select Committee of the House of Commons proposed to be set up under the Scheme unless such legislation is of a temporary character and limited to a period of one year only, the said legislation being in any case made renewable without such approval in the last resort.

Fiscal Autonomy

Resolution V. This Congress is strongly of opinion that it is essential for the welfare of the Indian people that the Indian Legislature should have the same measure of fiscal autonomy which the self-governing dominions of the Empire possess.

Saving such equal and equitable Imperial obligations as may be agreed upon as resting on all parts of the Empire, the Government of India, acting under the control of the Legislature, should enjoy the same power of regulating the fiscal policy of India as the Governments of the self-governing dominions enjoy of regulating their fiscal policy.

Reform Proposals

Resolution VI. That this Congress appreciates the earnest attempt on the part of the Right Hon. the Secretary of State and his Excellency the Viceroy to inaugurate a system of responsible government in India, and, while it recognizes that some of the proposals constitute an advance on the present conditions in some directions, it is of opinion that the proposals are as a whole disappointing and unsatisfactory, and suggests the following modifications as absolutely necessary to constitute a substantial step towards responsible government:

'This Conference cordially welcomes the Reform Proposals of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India as constituting a distinct advance on present conditions as regards the Government of India and the Provincial Governments and also a real step towards the progressive realization of "responsible government" in the Provincial Government in due fulfilment of the terms of the announcement of August 20, 1917. As such this Conference accords its hearty support to those proposals, and, while suggesting necessary modifications and improvements therein, expresses its grateful appreciation of the earnest effort of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford to start the country on a career of genuine and lasting progress towards the promised goal.'

'This Conference regards all attempts at the condemnation or rejection of the Reform Scheme as a whole as ill advised, and in particular protests emphatically against the reactionary attitude assumed towards it by the Indo-British Association and some European public bodies in this country which is certain to produce, if successfully persisted in, an extremely undesirable state of feeling between England and India and imperil the cause of ordered progress in this country. This Conference, therefore, most earnestly urges his Majesty's Government and Parliament of the United

Kingdom to give effect to the provisions of the Scheme and the suggestion of its supporters in regard thereto as early as possible by suitable legislation.

Government of India

Provincial Governments

1. There should be no additional members of the Executive Government without portfolios.
2. From the commencement of the first Council the principle of responsibility of the ministers to the legislature shall come into force.
3. The status and salary of the ministers shall be the same as that of the members of Executive Council.
4. At least half the number of Executive Councillors in charge of reserved subjects (if there be more than one) should be Indians.
5. The Budget shall be under the control of the Legislature subject to the contribution to the Government of India, and during the life-time of the reformed Councils, to the allocation of a fixed sum for the re- served subjects; and should fresh taxation be necessary, it should be imposed by the provincial Governments, as a whole for both transferred and reserved subjects.

INDIA'S CLAIM TO FISCAL AUTONOMY "INDUSTRIES AND TARIFFS"

I beg to record my strong opinion that in the matter of Indian industries we are bound to consider Indian interests firstly, secondly, and thirdly. I mean by "firstly' that the local raw products should be utilised, by secondly, that industries should be introduced and by "thirdly" that the profits of such industry should remain in the country.

Sir Frederick Nicholson

Quoted on page 300, Report of the Indian Industrial Commission, 1916-1918.

Economic bondage is the worst of all bondages. Economic dependence, or the lack of economic independence, is the source

of all misery, individual or national. A person economically dependent upon another is a virtual slave, despite appearances. He who supplies food and raiment and the necessities of life is the real master. The desire for gain dominates the world and all its activities. Even religion, as ordinarily understood, interpreted and administered, is a game of pounds and shillings, say what one may to the contrary. There are exceptions to this statement, but they are few and far between. The world does not subsist by bread alone, but without bread it cannot exist even for a minute. The generality of the world cares more for bread than for anything else, though there are individuals and groups of individuals who would not stoop to obtain bread by dishonorable means and those also who would die rather than obtain bread by the violation of their soul.

There are numerous ways in which a subject nation feels the humiliation and helplessness of her position, but none is so telling and so effective as the subordination of her economic interests to those of the dominant power. This is especially true in these days of free and easy transportation, of quick journeys, and of scientific warfare. In any struggle between nations, the victory eventually must rest with the one in possession of the largest number of "silver bullets. " It is true that silver bullets alone will not do unless there are brains and bodies to use them, but the latter without the former are helpless.

A nation may be the greatest producer of food; yet she may die of hunger from lack of ability to keep her own produce for herself. Food obeys the behest of the silver bullets. The law of self-preservation, therefore, requires only that nations be free to regulate their own household, subject to the condition that thereby they do not violate the rules of humanity or trample upon the rights of any human being.

Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have, in parts of their Report, been extremely candid. The value of their joint production lies in this candidness. In no other part, perhaps, have they been so candid as in the one dealing with "Industries and Tariff." In Paragraph 331 they frankly admit the truth of the following observation of the late Mr. Ranade on the economic effects of British rule in India:

"The political domination of one country by another attracts far more attention than the more formidable, though more unfelt, domination which the capital, enterprise and skill of one country exercise over the trade and manufactures of another. This latter domination has an insidious influence which paralyses the springs of all the various activities which together make up the life of a nation.' '

In the course of a letter addressed to the Westminster Gazette in 191 7, Lord Curzon said that "the fiscal policy of India during the last thirty or forty years has been shaped far more in Manchester than in Calcutta." This candid admission about "the sub- ordination of Indian fiscal policy to the Secretary of State and a House of Commons powerfully affected by Lancashire influence," is the keynote of the Indian demand for Home Rule.

The authors of the Montagu- Chelmsford Report say so quite frankly and fairly in Paragraphs 332 to 336 of their report, from which we make the following extracts: "The people are poor; and their poverty raises the question whether the general level of well-being could not be materially raised by the development of industries. It is also clear that the lack of outlet for educated youth is a serious misfortune which has contributed not a little in the past to political unrest in Bengal. But perhaps an even greater mischief is the discontent aroused in the minds of those who are jealous for India by seeing that she is so largely de- pendent on foreign countries for manufactured goods. They noted that her foreign trade was always growing, but they also saw that its leading feature continued to be the barter of raw materials valued at relatively low prices for imported manufactures, which obviously afforded profits and prosperity to other countries industrially more advanced. Patriotic Indians might well ask themselves why these profits should not accrue to their country: and also why so large a portion of the industries which flourished in the country was financed by European capital and managed by European skill."

"The fact that India's foreign trade was largely with the United Kingdom gave rise to a suspicion that her industrial backwardness was positively encouraged in the interests of British manufactures, and the maintenance of the excise duty

on locally manufactured cotton goods in the alleged interests of Lancashire is very widely accepted as a conclusive proof of such a purpose. On a smaller scale, the maintenance of a Stores Department at the India Office is looked upon as an encouragement to the Government to patronize British at the expense of local manufacturers."

There can thus be no autonomy without fiscal autonomy. In fact, the latter alone is the determining characteristic of an autonomous existence.

The one national trait which distinguishes the British from other nations of the world is their habit of truthfulness and frankness. When we say that we do not thereby mean that all Britishers are equally truthful " to the same extent and degree. But we do mean that on the whole the British nation has a larger percentage of truthful and candid persons in her family than any other nation on the face of the earth. Where their interests clash with those of others, they can be as hard, exacting and cruel as any one else in the world. But repentance overtakes them sooner than it does the others. They have a queer but admirable faculty of introspection which few other people possess to the same extent and in the same numbers. This is what endears them even to those who are never tired of cursing their snobbishness and masterful imperialism. The faculty of occasionally seeing themselves with the eyes of others, makes them the most successful rulers of men. They are as a nation lacking in imagination, but there are individuals amongst them who can see, if they will, their own faults; who can and do speak out their minds honestly and truthfully, even though by so doing they may temporarily earn odium and unpopularity.

The remarks and observations of the eminent authors of the Report relating to the fiscal relations of India and England reflect the honesty of their purpose and the sincerity of their mind as no other part of the Report does. They have entered upon the subject with great diffidence and, though expressing themselves with marked candor and fairness, have I refrained from making any definite recommendations. In this respect it will be only fair to acknowledge the equally candid opinion of Mr. Austin Chamberlain, who, in 191 7, made a most significant confession

by stating on an important occasion that " India will not remain, and ought not to remain content to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the rest of the Empire. "

To our simple minds, not accustomed to the anomalies of official life, it seems inexplicable how, after these candid admissions, the authors could have any hesitation in recommending the only remedy by which India's wrong could be righted and her economic rights secured in the future " viz., fiscal autonomy.

In Paragraph 335 the authors of the report give the genesis of the Swadeshi boycott movement of 1905, and very pertinently observe that "in Japanese progress , and efficiency" the educated Indians see "an example of what could be effected by an Asiatic nation free of foreign control," or in other words, of what could be , achieved by India, if she had a national government I of her own interested in her industrial advance. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford thus rightly observe that "English theories to the appropriate limits of the State's activity are inapplicable in India" and that if the resources of the country are to be developed the Government must take action.

"After the war," add the authors, "the need for industrial development will be all the greater unless India is to become a mere dumping-ground for the manufactures of foreign nations which will then be competing all the more keenly for the markets on which their political strength so perceptibly depends. India will certainly consider herself entitled to claim all the help that her Government can give her to enable her to take her place as a manufacturing country; and unless the claim is admitted it will surely turn into an insistent request for a tariff which will penalize imported articles without respect of origin." Further on the Report states:

"We are agreed therefore that there must be a definite change of view; and that the Government must admit and shoulder its responsibility for furthering the industrial development of the country. The difficulties by this time are well-known. In the past, and partly as a result of recent swadeshi experiences, India's capital has not generally been readily available; among some communities at least there is apparent distaste for practical

training, and a comparative weakness of mutual trust; skilled labour is lacking, and although labour is plentiful, education is needed to inculcate a higher standard of living and so to secure a continuous supply; there is a dearth of technical institutions; there is also a want of practical information about the commercial potentialities of India's war products. Though these are serious difficulties, they are not insuperable; but they will be overcome only if the State comes forward boldly as guide and helper. On the other hand, there are good grounds for hope. India has great natural resources, mineral and vegetable. She has furnished supplies of manganese, tungsten, mica, jute, copra, lac, etc., for use in the war. She has abundant coal, even if its geographical distribution is uneven; she has also in her large rivers ample means of creating water-power. There is good reason for believing that she will greatly increase her output of oil. Her forest wealth is immense, and much of it only awaits the introduction of modern means of transportation, a bolder investment of capital, and the employment of extra staff; while the patient and laborious work of conservation that has been steadily proceeding joined with modern scientific methods of improving supplies and increasing output, will yield a rich harvest in the future. We have been assured that Indian capital will be forthcoming once it is realized that it can be invested with security and profit in India; a purpose that will be furthered by the provision of increased facilities for banking and credit. Labor, though abundant, is handicapped by still pursuing uneconomical methods, and its output would be greatly increased by the extended use of machinery. We have no doubt that there is an immense scope for the application of scientific methods. Conditions are ripe for the development of new and for the revival of old industries, and the real enthusiasm for industries which is not confined to the ambitions of a few individuals but rests on the general desire to see Indian capital and labour applied jointly to the good of the country, seem to us the happiest augury."

The views of educated India about fiscal policy have been very faithfully reproduced in Paragraphs 341 and 342, which also we reproduce almost bodily:

" Connected intimately with the matter of industries is the question of the Indian tariff. This subject was excluded from the deliberations of the Industrial Commission now sitting because it was not desirable at that juncture to raise any question of the modification of India's fiscal policy; but its exclusion was none the less the object of some legitimate criticism in India. The changes which we propose in the Government of India will still leave the settlement of India's tariff in the hands of a government amenable to Parliament and the Secretary of State; but inasmuch as the tariff reacts on many matters which will henceforth come more and more under Indian control, we think it well that we should put forward for the information of His Majesty's Government the views of educated Indians upon this subject. We have no immediate proposals to make; we are anxious merely that any decisions which may hereafter be taken should be taken with full appreciation of educated Indian opinion.

"The theoretical free trader, we believe, hardly exists in India at present. As was shown by the debates in the Indian Legislative Council in March,* 191 3, educated Indian opinion ardently desires a tariff.! It rightly wishes to find another substantial basis than that of the land for Indian revenues, and it turns to a tariff to provide one. Desiring industries which will give him Indian-made clothes to wear and ¢ Indian- made articles to use, the educated Indian looks to the example of other countries which have relied on tariffs, and seizes on the admission of even free traders that for the nourishment of nascent industries a tariff is permissible. We do not know whether he pauses to reflect that these industries will be largely financed by foreign capital attracted by the tariff, although we have evidence that he has not learned to appreciate the advantages of foreign capital. But whatever economic fallacy underlies his reasoning, these are his firm beliefs; and though he may be willing to concede the possibility that he is wrong, he will not readily concede that it is our business to decide the matter for him. He believes that as long as we continue to decide for him we shall decide in the interests of England and not according to his wishes; and he points to the debate in the House of Commons on the differentiation of the cotton excise in support of his contention. So long as the people who refuse India protection are interested in manufactures with which India might

compete, Indian opinion cannot bring itself to believe that the refusal is disinterested or dictated by care for the best interests of India. This real and keen desire for fiscal autonomy does not mean that educated opinion in India is unmindful of Imperial obligations. . . "

These admissions should put India's claims for fiscal autonomy beyond the range of doubt and dispute, but so strange are the ways of modern statesmanship that consistency and logic are not the necessary accompaniments thereof. The authors have advanced another very strong argument for the economic development of India, viz., " military value," which makes the case conclusive. This argument has been supplied by the Great War and is so well known that we need not state it in their words.

If India is to prosper and take her legitimate place in the British Commonwealth, and in the great family of Nations of the World, it is absolutely necessary that she should be given complete fiscal freedom to manage her own affairs, develop her own industries and do her own trading. Considering her size and resources, it wounds her self-respect and makes her feel exceedingly mean and small to go begging for alms and charity every time there is a failure of rains and the cry of famine is raised.

For a nation of 315 millions of human beings living in a country which nature has endowed with all its choicest blessings, rich and fertile soil, plenty of water and sun, an abundant supply of metals and coal, willing labor, artistic skill and a power of manipulating for beauty and elegance unexcelled in the world " to exist in pitiful economic dependence is a condition most deplorable and most pathetic. We want no charity, no concessions, no favors, no preference. What we most earnestly beg and ask for is an opportunity.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

In December, 1917, the Government of India appointed a committee of three Englishmen and two Indians (1) "to investigate and report on the nature and extent of the criminal conspiracies connected with the revolutionary movements in India, (2) to examine and consider the difficulties that have arisen in dealing with such conspiracies and to advise as to the legislation, if any, necessary to enable the government to deal effectively with them." Of the three English members, Mr. Justice Rowlatt of the King's Bench Division, England, was appointed as president, and of the other two, one was a judge in the service of the Government and the other a member of a Board of Revenue in one of the Indian Provinces. Of the two Indians, one was a judge and the other a practising lawyer.

This committee submitted its report in April, 191 8, which was published by the Government of India in July of the same year. The president, Mr. Justice Rowlatt's letter covering the report gives the nature of the evidence upon which their report is based, which is as follows: "Statements have been placed before us with documentary evidence by the Governments of Bengal, Bombay, Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces, the United Provinces, the Punjab and Burmah as well as by the Government of India. In every case, except that of Madras, we were further attended by officers of the government, presenting this statement, who gave evidence before us. In the two provinces in which we held sittings, namely, Bengal and Punjab, we further invited and secured the attendance of individuals, or as deputed by associations, of gentlemen who we thought might give us information from various non-official points of view."

It is clear from this statement that the investigation of the committee was neither judicial nor even semi- judicial; it was a purely administrative inquiry conducted behind the backs of the individuals concerned, without the latter having any opportunity of cross- examining the witnesses or giving their explanations of the evidence against them. While the different Governments in India were fully represented in each case by the ablest of their servants, the individuals investigated were not. We do not want to insinuate that either the Governments or the officers deputed by them were unfair in their evidence. All that we want to point out is that the other side had no opportunity of putting their case before the committee. Consequently, it is no wonder that one comes across many traces of political and racial bias both in the introduction and the Report.

The very first paragraph of the introduction betrays either ignorance on the part of the committee about the ancient history

of India, or a deliberate misrepresentation of the nature of the Hindu State. The committee says: "Republican or Parliamentary forms of governments as at present understood were neither desired nor known in India until after the establishment of British rule. In the Hindu State the form of government was an absolute monarchy, though the monarch was by the Hindu Shastras hedged round by elaborate rules for securing the welfare of his subjects and was assisted by a body of councillors, the chief of whom were Brahmin members of the priestly class which derived authority from a time when the priests were the sole repositories of knowledge and therefore the natural instruments of administration." The statements made in this paragraph do not represent the whole truth.

The committee ignores the fact that Republican or Parliamentary forms of Government "as at present understood" were neither desired nor known in any part of the world, except perhaps England itself until after the establishment of British rule in India. 1 Then the committee has altogether ignored that, in the Hindu State, the form of government was not an absolute monarchy always and in all parts of India. There is ample historical evidence to prove that India had many Republican States, along with oligarchies and monarchies at one and the same period of her history. The second part of the second sentence is also not correct, because the priestly class derived its authority from a time when the priests were not the sole repositories of knowledge. The several Hindu political treatises belong to a period when the whole populace was highly educated and could take substantial part in the determination of the affairs of their country.

Equally misleading is the last sentence of the introduction where the committee says that it is among the Chitpavan Brahmins of the Poona district that they first find indications of a revolutionary movement. This statement is incorrect, if it means that after the establishment of British rule in India no attempt had been made to overthrow it prior to the Revolutionary movement inaugurated by the Poona Brahmins. The statement ignores three such attempts which are known to history; viz., (a) the great Mutiny of 1857, (b) the Wahabee Rebellion of Bengal, and (c) the Kiika Rebellion of the Punjab; not to mention other minor attempts

made in other places by other people. Yet we think that this report is a very valuable document, giving in one place the history and the progress of the Revolutionary Movement in India. The findings and the recommendations of the committee may not be all correct, but the material collected and published for the first time is too valuable to be neglected by anyone who wants to have an intelligent grasp of the political situation in India, such as has developed within the last twenty years.

The committee gives a summary of its conclusions as to the conspiracies in Chapter XV, which copy verbatim:

"In Bombay they have been purely Brahmin and mostly Chitpavan. In Bengal the conspirators have been young men belonging to the educated middle classes. Their propaganda has been elaborate, persistent and ingenious. In their own province it has produced a long series of murders and robberies. In Bihar and Orissa, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Madras, it took no root, but occasionally led to crime and disorder. In the Punjab the return of emigrants from America, bent on revolution and bloodshed, produced numerous outrages and the Ghadr conspiracy of 1915. In Burma, too, the Ghadr movement was active, but was arrested.

"Finally came a Mohammedan conspiracy confined to a small clique of fanatics and designed to overthrow British rule with foreign aid.

"All these plots have been directed towards one and the same objective, the overthrow by force of British rule in India. Sometimes they have been isolated; sometimes they have been interconnected; sometimes they have been encouraged and supported by German influence. All have been successfully encountered with the support of Indian loyalty."

In this general summary the committee has made no attempt to trace out the causes that led to the inauguration of the revolutionary movement and its subsequent progress. A chapter on that subject would have been most illuminating.

In chapters dealing with provinces they have selected some individuals and classes on whom to lay blame for "incitements" to murders and crimes, but have entirely failed to analyze the

social, political and economic conditions which made such incitements and their success possible.

It is clear even from this summary that the only two provinces where the revolutionary propaganda took root and resulted in more than occasional outrages were Bengal and the Punjab.

In the Bombay Presidency, revolutionary outrages did not exceed three within a period of 20 years (from 1897 to 191 7), two murders and one bomb-throwing. Besides, three trials for conspiracies are mentioned all within a year (1909-1910), two in Native States and one in British territory. Altogether 82 men were prosecuted for being involved in these conspiracies. The total result comes to this, that in the course of 20 years about 100 persons were found to be involved in a revolutionary movement in a territory embracing an area of 186,923 square miles and a population of 27 million human beings. This is surely by no means a formidable record justifying extraordinary legislation such as is proposed. 1 The net loss of human life did not exceed three, though unfortunately all three victims were Europeans.

Bihar and Orissa formed part of the province of Bengal during most of the period covered by the revolutionary movement of Bengal, viz., from 1906 to 1917. It was in Bihar which was then a part of Bengal, that in 1908, the first bomb was thrown. The only other revolutionary outrage that took place in Bihar was one in 1913, resulting in the murder of two Indians.

In the United Provinces of Agra and Oude, the only tangible evidence of revolutionary activity recorded by the committee is the Benares Conspiracy that came to light in 1915-1916. The only outrage noted is that of the alleged murder of a fellow revolutionary by a member of the same gang.

To the Central provinces the committee has given a practically clean bill. In Madras the revolutionary outrages consisted of one murder (of a European Magistrate) and one conspiracy involving nine persons. The conspiracies and intrigues detected in Burma are ascribed to people of other provinces and not a single outrage from that province itself is reported. So we find that in the period from 1906 to 1907, Since enacted. In the Punjab, again, the first revolutionary crime took place in December, 191 2, and the second

in 1913 and the rest all during the War. Cases of seditious utterances and writings are not included in the term "revolutionary crime" used in the above paragraphs. It was from Bengal, then, that before the War revolutionary propaganda was carried on to any large extent, revolutionary movements organized and revolutionary crimes committed. About half of the Report deals with Bengal and the general findings of the committee may be thus summarized:

(1) That the object of the movement was the overturning of "the British government in India by violent means" (p. 15 and also p. 19).

(2) That the class among whom the movement spread was comprised of the Bhadralok (the respectable middle class). The committee says:

"The people among whom he (i.e., Barendra, the first Bengali revolutionary propagandist) worked, the bhadralok of Bengal, have been for centuries peaceful and unwarlike, but, through the influence of the great central city of Calcutta, were early in appreciating the advantages of Western learning. They are mainly Hindus and their leading castes are Brahmins, Kayasthas and Vaidyas; but with the spread of English education some other castes too have adopted bhadralok ideals and modes of life. Bhadralok abound in villages as well as in towns, and are thus more interwoven with the landed classes than are the literate Indians of other provinces. Wherever they live or settle, they earnestly desire and often provide English education for their sons. The consequence is that a number of Anglo-vernacular schools, largely maintained by private enterprise, have sprung up throughout the towns and villages of Bengal.

No other province of India possesses a network of rural schools in which English is taught. These schools are due to the enterprise of the bhadralok and to the fact that, as British rule gradually spread from Bengal over Northern India, the scope of employment for English-educated Bengalis spread with it. Originally they predominated in all offices and higher grade schools throughout Upper

India. They were also, with the Parsees, the first Indians to send their sons to England for education, to qualify for the Bar, or to compete for the higher grades of the Civil and Medical services. When, however, similar classes in other provinces also acquired a working knowledge of English, the field for Bengali enterprise gradually shrank. In their own province bhadralok still almost monopolize the clerical and subordinate administrative services of Government. They are prominent in medicine, in teaching and at the Bar. But, in spite of these advantages, they have felt the shrinkage of foreign employment; and as the education which they receive is generally literary and ill-adapted to incline the youthful mind to industrial, commercial or agricultural pursuits, they have not succeeded in finding fresh outlets for their energies. Their hold on land, too, has weakened, owing to increasing pressure of population and excessive sub-infeudation.

Altogether their economic prospects have narrowed, and the increasing numbers who draw fixed incomes have felt the pinch of rising prices. On the other hand, the memories and associations of their earlier prosperity, combined with growing contact with Western ideas and standards of comfort, have raised their expectations of the pecuniary remuneration which should reward a laborious and, to their minds, a costly education. Thus as bhadralok learned in English have become more and more numerous, a growing number have become less and less inclined to accept the conditions of life in which they found themselves on reaching manhood. Bhadralok have always been prominent among the supporters of Indian political movements; and their leaders have watched with careful attention events in the world outside India. The large majority of the people of Bengal are not bhadralok but cultivators, and in the eastern districts mainly Muhammadans; but the cultivators of the province are absorbed in their own pursuits, in litigation, and in religious and caste observances. It was not to them but to his own class that Barendra appealed. When he renewed his efforts

in 1904, the thoughts of many members of this class had been stirred by various powerful influences."

We have given this lengthy extract as it shows conclusively (a) that the movement originated and spread among people who had received Western education, most of the leaders having been educated in England and (b) that the root cause of the movement was economic.

(3) That various circumstances occasioned by certain Government measures " specially favored the development" of the movement (p. 16). Among the measures specially mentioned are (a) the University law of Lord Curzon "which was interpreted by politicians as designed to limit the numbers of Indians educated in English and thus to retard national advance"; (b) the partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon. "It was the agitation that attended and followed on this measure that brought previous discontent to a climax."

(4) That the revolutionary movement received a substantial impetus by the failure of constitutional agitation for the reversal of the policy that decided on partitioning Bengal into two divisions. This failure led to two different kinds of agitation, open and secret: (a) open economic defiance by Swadeshi and boycott " Swadeshi was the affirmative and boycott the negative form of the same movement. Swadeshi enjoined the use of country made articles; boycott was directed against English imports, (b) open propaganda by a more outspoken and in some instances violent press, (c) open control of educational agencies by means of national institutions, (d) open stimulus to physical education and physical culture, (e) nationalistic interpretation of religious dogma and forms (open), (f) organization of secret societies for more violent propaganda, for learning and teaching the use of firearms, for the manufacture of bombs, for illicit purchase and stealing of firearms, for assassination and murder, (g) secret attempts to tamper with the army, (h) conspiracies for terroristic purposes and for obtaining sinews of war by theft, robbery and extortion.

The following two extracts which the committee has taken from one of the publications of the revolutionary party called Mukti Kon Pathe (what is the path of salvation) will explain clauses (f) and (g) and (h). "The book further points out that not much muscle was required to shoot Europeans, that arms could be procured by grim determination, and that weapons could be prepared silently in some secret place. Indians could be sent to foreign countries to learn the art of making weapons. The assistance of Indian soldiers must be obtained. They must be made to understand the misery and wretchedness of the country. The heroism of Sivaji must be remembered. As long as revolutionary work remained in its infancy, expenses could be met by subscriptions. But as work advanced, money must be extracted from society by the application of force. If the revolution is being brought about for the welfare of society, then it is perfectly just to collect money from society for that purpose. It is admitted that theft and dacoity are crimes because they violate the principle of good society. But the political dacoit is aiming at the good of society, "so no sin but rather virtue attaches to the destruction of this small good for the sake of some higher good. Therefore if revolutionaries extort money from the miserly or luxurious members of society by the application of force, their conduct is perfectly just."

Mukti Kon Pathe further exhorts its readers to obtain the "help of the native soldiers. . . . Although these soldiers for the sake of their stomach accept service in the Government of the ruling power, still they are nothing but men made of flesh and blood. They, too, know (how) to think; when therefore the revolutionaries explain to them the woes and miseries of the country, they, in proper time, swell the ranks of the revolutionaries with arms and weapons given them by the ruling power. . . . Because it is possible to persuade the soldiers in this way, the modern English Raj of India does not allow the cunning Bengalis to enter into the ranks of the army. . . . Aid in the shape of arms may be secretly obtained by securing the help of the foreign ruling powers."

(5) That except in five cases the idea of private gain never entered into the activities of the revolutionaries and of the five persons referred to three were taxi-cab drivers either hired or coerced to cooperate in revolutionary enterprise (p. 20).

(6) That "the circumstances that robberies and murders are being committed by young men of respect- able extraction, students at schools and colleges, is indeed an amazing phenomenon the occurrence of which in most countries would be hardly credible."

(7) That "since the year 1906 revolutionary outrages in Bengal have numbered 210 and attempts at committing such outrages have amounted to 101. Definite information is in the hands of the police of the complicity of no less than 1038 persons in these offences. But of these, only 84 persons have been convicted of specified crimes in 39 prosecutions, and of these per- sons, 30 were tried by tribunals constituted under the Defence of India Act. Ten attempts have been made to strike at revolutionary conspiracies by means of prosecutions directed against groups or branches. In these prosecutions 192 persons were involved, 63 of whom were convicted. Eighty-two revolutionaries have rendered themselves liable to be bound over to be of good behaviour under the preventive sections of the Criminal Procedure Code. In regard to 51 of these, there is direct evidence of complicity in outrages. There have, moreover, been 59 prosecutions under the Arms and Explosives Acts which have resulted in convictions of 58 persons."

We wish the committee had also supplemented this information by a complete record of the punishments that were imposed on persons convicted of revolutionary crime in the ten years from 1906 to 191 7. We are sure such a statement would have been most informing and illuminating. It would have conclusively established the soundness of the half-hearted finding that "the convictions . . . did not have as much effect as might have been expected in repressing crime." In fact they had no effect. They only added fuel to the fire.

(8) That persons involved in revolutionary crime belonged to all castes and occupations and the vast bulk of them were non-Brahmins. They were of all ages, from 10-15 to over 45 > the majority being under 25. The committee has in an appendix (p. 93) given three tables of statistics as to age, caste, occupation or profession of persons convicted in Bengal of revolutionary crimes or killed in commission of such crimes during the years 1907-19 17. This clause is based on these statistics.

We are afraid, however, that these statistics do not afford quite a correct index of the age, caste, occupation and position of all the people in Bengal that were and are sympathetically interested in the revolutionary movement of Bengal.

In investigating reasons for failure of ordinary machinery for the prevention, detection and punishment of crime in Bengal, the committee has assigned six reasons: (a) want of evidence, (b) paucity of police, (c) facilities enjoyed by criminals, (d) difficulty in proof of possession of arms, etc., (e) distrust of evidence, (f) the uselessness, in general, of confession made to the Police. These reasons, however, do not represent the whole truth. Some of the most daring crimes were committed in broad daylight, in much frequented streets of the metropolis and in the presence of numerous people. Moreover, the Government did not depend on ordinary law. Measure after measure was enacted to expedite and facilitate convictions. Extraordinary provisions were made to meet all the difficulties pointed out by the committee and extraordinary sentences were given in the case of conviction. Yet the Government failed either to extirpate the movement or to check it effectively or to bring the majority of offenders to book.

The members of the committee have frankly admitted: "That we do not expect very much from punitive measures. The conviction of offenders will never check such a movement as that which grew up in Bengal unless the leaders can be convicted at the outset." They pin their faith on "preventive" measures recommended by them. It was perhaps not within their scope to say that the most effective preventive measure was the removal of the political and economic causes , that had generated the movement. The committee has studiously avoided discussing that

important point, but now and then they have incidentally furnished the real clue to the situation. Discussing the "accessibility of Bengal schools and colleges to Revolutionary influences," they quote a passage from one of the reports of the Director of Public Instruction in Bengal. We copy below the whole of this paragraph, as, to us, it seems to be very pertinent to the issue.

"Accessibility of Bengal Schools and Colleges to Revolutionary Influences. " Abundant evidence has compelled us to the conclusion that the secondary English schools, and in a less degree the colleges, of Bengal have been regarded by the revolutionaries as their most fruitful recruiting centres. Dispersed as these schools are far and wide throughout the Province, sometimes clustering in a town, sometimes isolated in the far-away villages of the eastern water-country, they form natural objects for attack; and as is apparent from the reports of the Department of Public Instruction, they have been attacked for years with no small degree of success. In these reports the Director has from time to time noticed such matters as the circulation of seditious leaflets, the number of students implicated in conspiracy cases and the apathy of parents and guardians. But perhaps his most instructive passages are the following, in which he sets out the whole situation in regard to secondary English schools. 'The number of these schools,' he wrote, 'is rapidly increasing, and the cry is for more and more. It is a demand for tickets in a lottery, the prizes of which are posts in Government service and employment in certain professions. The bhadralok have nothing to look to but these posts, while those who desire to rise from a lower social or economic station have their eyes on the same goal. The middle classes in Bengal are generally poor, and the increased stress of competition and the tendency for the average earnings of certain careers to decrease " a tendency which is bound to follow on the increased demand to enter them, coupled with the rise in the cost of living and the inevitable raising in the standard of comfort " all these features continue to make the struggle to exist in these classes keener.

Hence the need to raise educational standards, to make school life a greater influence for good and the course of instruction more thorough and more comprehensive. A need which becomes more and more imperative as life in India becomes more complicated

and more exacting is confronted by a determined though perfectly natural opposition to the raising of fees. . . . Probably the worst feature of the situation is the low wages and the complete absence of prospects which are the fate of teachers in the secondary schools. ... It is easy to blame the parents for blindness to their sons' true good, but the matriculation examination is the thing that seems to matter, so that if his boy passes the annual promotion examinations and is duly presented at that examination at the earliest possible date, the average parent has no criticism to offer.

This is perfectly natural, but the future of Bengal depends to a not inconsiderable extent on the work done in its secondary schools, and more is required of these institutions than an ability to pass a certain proportion of boys through the Calcutta University Matriculation examination. . . . The present condition of secondary schools is undoubtedly prejudicing the development of the presidency and is by no means a negligible feature in the existing state of general disturbance. It is customary to trace the genesis of much sedition and crime to the back streets and lanes of Calcutta and Dacca, where the organizers of anarchic conspiracies seek their agents from among University students. This view is correct as far as it goes, but it is in the high schools, with their underpaid and discontented teachers, their crowded, dark and ill-ventilated classrooms, and their soul-destroying process of unceasing cram, that the seeds of discontent and fanaticism are sown."

Yet for years nothing was done to improve education, to make it practical and creative and productive. In fact nothing has been done up till now.

Let the reader read with this the report of the Indian Industrial Commission recently issued under the authority of the Government of India and he will at once find the true causes which underlie the revolutionary movement in India. These causes are not in any way peculiar to Bengal or to the Punjab,* they are common to the whole of India, but they have found a fruitful soil in these provinces on account of the rather intense natures of the people of these two provinces. The Bengali is an intensely patriotic and emotional being, very sensitive and very resentful; the Punjabee is intensely virile, passionate and plucky, having developed a strong, forceful character by centuries of resistance to all kind of invasions and

attacks. Of the Punjab, however, we will speak later on. For the present we are concerned with Bengal only.

The amazing phenomenon mentioned by the committee on p. 20 and referred to by us before is easily explained by the facts hinted in the Directors' report quoted above. And this notwithstanding the fact that in the matter of Government patronage Bengal has been the most favored province in India, throughout the period of British rule. To the Bengalis have gone all the first appointments to offices that were thrown open to the natives of the soil. They have been the recipients of the highest honors from the Government. Bengal is virtually the only province permanently settled where the Government cannot add to the Land tax fixed in 1793. The Bengalis are the people who spread over India, with every territorial extension of the British Raj. They have been the pampered and favored children of the Government and for very good reasons, too. They are the best educated and the most intelligent of all the Indian peoples.

They know how to adapt themselves to all conditions and circumstances, they know how to enjoy and also how to suffer. They have subtle brains and supple bodies. The British Government could not do without them. It cannot do without them even now. Yet it was this most loyal and most dutiful, this most westernized and the best educated class which laid the foundations of the revolutionary movement and has been carrying it on successfully in face of all the forces of such a mighty Government as that of the British in India. What is the reason? It is the utter economic helplessness of the younger generation, aided by a sense of extreme humiliation and degradation.

The Government never earnestly applied itself to the solution of the problem. They did nothing to reduce poverty and make education practical. Every time the budget was discussed the Indian members pressed for increased expenditure on education. All their proposals and motions were rejected by the standing official majorities backed by the whole force of non-official Europeans including the missionaries. The Government thus deliberately sowed the wind. Is there any wonder that it is now reaping the whirlwind? The cause is economic; the remedy must be economic. Make education practical, foster industries, open all

Government careers to the sons of the soil, reduce the cost on the military and civil services, let the people determine the fiscal policy of the country and the revolutionary movement will subside. Die it will not, so long as there is foreign domination and foreign exploitation. Even after India has attained Home Rule it will not die. It has come to stay. India is a part of the world and revolution is in the air all the world over. The effort to kill it by repression and suppression is futile, unwise and stupid.

THE PUNJAB

We may now consider the case of the Punjab. Lord Morley's verdict notwithstanding, it is abundantly clear that the troubles of 1907, with which the history of unrest in the Punjab begins, were principally agrarian in their origin. Lord Morley's speech in the House of Commons (in 1907) as to the root of the trouble was based on reports supplied to him by the Government of the Punjab and we know from personal knowledge how unreliable many of these reports are. We may here illustrate this point by a few extracts from these documents.

Lord Morley stated that: " There were twenty- eight meetings known to have been held by the leading agitators in the Punjab between 1st March and 1st May. Of these five only related, even ostensibly, to agricultural grievances; the remaining twenty- three were all purely political."

The number of meetings held from March 1 to May 1, 1907 was, at the lowest calculation, at least double of 28, or perhaps treble, and most of them related "even ostensibly to agricultural grievances"; the number of purely political meetings could not have exceeded ten or twelve.

On p. 61 the committee writes that "Chatarji's father too had ordered him home on discovering that he was staying with Hardayal in the house of Lajpat Rai." The whole of this statement is absolutely false. I am prepared to swear and to prove that Chatarji did not stay in my house even for a single night. He came there a few times with Hardayal. Hardayal was at that time living in a house he had rented for himself in the native city about one mile from my place which is in the Civil Station on the Lower Mall.

On the same page the committee has approvingly quoted a sentence from the judgment of the Sessions Judge in the Delhi Conspiracy Case. Speaking of Amir Chand, one of the accused in that case who was sentenced to death, the Sessions Judge describes him as "one who spent his life in furthering murderous schemes which he was too timid to carry out himself." Now I happen to have known this man for about 20 years before his conviction. I have no doubt that he was rightly convicted in this case but I have no doubt also that this description of him by the Sessions Judge was absolutely wrong. Up till 19 10 the man had led an absolutely harmless life, helping students in their studies and otherwise rendering assistance, according to his means, to other needy people. No one ever credited him with violent views. His revolutionary career began in 1908. Before that he could not and would not have tolerated even the killing of an ant, much less that of human beings.

In governments by bureaucracies one of the standing formulas of official etiquette is never to question the findings of facts arrived at by your superiors or predecessors. This naturally leads to the perpetuation of mistakes. A wrong conclusion once accepted continues to be good for all times to come. The Rowlatt Committee has studiously acted on that formula throughout its present inquiry. They have invariably accepted the findings of executive and judicial authorities preceding them about the incidents that happened since 1907, without making any independent inquiry of their own. Hence their opinion about the original or the principal cause of the unrest of 1907 in the Punjab is not entitled to greater weight than that of the Punjab officials whose mishandling of the affairs of the province produced the unrest. One ounce of fact, however, is of greater weight in the determination of issues than even a hundred theories. The fact that the Government of India had to veto the Punjab Government's Land Colonies Act in order to allay the unrest proves conclusively that the unrest was due to agrarian trouble.

The unrest of 1907 subsided after the repeal of the land legislation of 1907, but the legacy it left is still operative.

The Sikhs and the Mussulmans of the Punjab, as well as the military classes among the Hindus, the Rajputs and the Jats, are

the most virile portions of the population. They have fought the battles of the Empire. In the interests of the Empire they have travelled far and wide. Yet we find that educationally, as well as economically, they have suffered most. They have the largest numbers of illiterates among them. They are the least developed and the least progressive of all the classes in the Punjab. They are heavily in debt. The Government has occasionally recognised it and has tried to satisfy them by preferential treatment in the filling of Government posts, or in the bestowal of titles or in nominating their supposed leaders to Legislative Councils. These ridiculous palliative measures, however, have failed in their objective. The classes disaffected do not get any satisfaction by these palliative measures. They need opportunities of education and economic betterment. These could not be provided without making education general and without a more equitable distribution of land among the agricultural classes and the inauguration of industries other than agriculture. This the Government never cared to do. The Sikhs and the Mussulmans naturally directed their attention to emigration.

The opportunities they found in other parts of the Empire whetted their appetites. They compared the conditions abroad with conditions at home and drew their own conclusions. Having helped in the expansion and development of the Empire they thought they were entitled to benefit therefrom. They demanded fair treatment. Instead they found the doors shut upon them. Even those that had been admitted were made to feel the humiliation of their position. Deliberate, active, concerted measures were taken to drive them away or to make life for them intolerable. Their wives and children were refused admittance and various pretexts were invented to keep them out or to drive them away. (The revolutionary movement in the Punjab amounted to nothing until it was rein- forced by the return of the Sikh members of the Ghadr party during the war. The Committee has failed to answer the question: Why did the Sikhs of Vancouver and California readily fall in with the schemes of Hardayal and Barkat Ullah, the alleged founders of the revolutionary party of California? These latter had nothing in common with the Sikhs. In language and religion, by habits and associations, they were poles apart from each other.

Why did then Hardayal's propaganda find such a ready soil among the Sikhs of Vancouver B. C. We quote from the report:

> *"The doctrines which he preached and circulated had reached the Sikhs and other Indians resident in British Columbia. At a meeting in Vancouver in December, 1913, a poem from the Ghadr newspaper was read, in which the Hindus were urged to expel the British from India. The main grievance of the Vancouver Indians was the Canadian immigration law under which every intending Asiatic immigrant, with a few particular exceptions, has to satisfy the Canadian authorities that he is in possession of 200 dollars and has travelled by a continuous 1 journey on a through ticket from his native country to Canada. In 19 13 three Sikh delegates visited the Punjab. They had come from America and were members of the Ghadr party who had come to reconnoitre the position. Their real purpose was recognised after their departure. They addressed meetings at various towns on the subject of the grievances of Indians in Canada and caused resolutions of protest to be passed in which all communities joined."*

Again, tracing the origin of the Budge-Budge riot, the Committee remarks:

> *"The central figure in the narrative is a certain Gurdit Singh, a Sikh of the Amritsar district in the Punjab, who had emigrated from India 15 years before, and had for some time carried on business as a contractor in Singapore and the Malay States. There is reason to believe that he returned to this country about 1909. He was certainly absent from Singapore for a space; and when he returned there, going on to Hong Kong, he interested himself in chartering a ship for the conveyance of Punjabis to Canada. Punjabis, and especially Sikhs, frequently seek employment in the Far East, and have for some time been tempted by the higher wages procurable in Canada. But their admission to that country is to some extent impeded by the immigration laws which we have described already.*

There were already in Canada about 4,000 Indians, chiefly Punjabis. Some of these were revolutionists of the Hardayal school, some were loyal, and some had migrated from the United States on account of labour differences there. The Committee of Enquiry,

which subsequently investigated the whole affair, considered that Gurdit Singh's action had been much influenced by advice and encouragement received from Indian residents in Canada. At any rate, after failing to secure a ship at Calcutta, he chartered a Japanese vessel named the Komagata Maru through a German agent at Hong Kong. He issued tickets and took in passengers at that post, at Shanghai, at Moji and at Yokohama. He certainly knew what the Canadian law was, but perhaps hoped to evade it by means of some appeal to the courts or by exercising political pressure. It is equally certain that many of his passengers had no clear comprehension of their prospects. The Tribunal that subsequently tried the first batch of Lahore conspirators held that probably Gurdit Singh's main object was to cause an inflammatory episode, as one of the witnesses stated that Gurdit Singh told his followers that should they be refused admission, they would return to India to expel the British. On April the 4th, 19 14, the Komagata Maru sailed from Hong Kong. On the 23rd of May the Komagata Maru arrived at Vancouver with 351 Sikhs and 21 Punjabi Muhammadans on board.

The local authorities refused to allow landing except in a very few cases, as the immigrants had not complied with the requirements of the law. Protests were made, and, while negotiations were proceeding, a balance of 22,000 dollars still due for the hire of the ship was paid by Vancouver Indians, and the charter was transferred to two prominent malcontents. . . . A body of police was sent to enforce the orders of the Canadian Government that the vessel should leave; but with the assistance of firearms, the police were beaten off, and it was only when a Government vessel was requisitioned with armed force that the Komagata Maru passengers, who had prevented their Captain from weighing anchor or getting up steam, were brought to terms. On the 23rd of July they started on their return journey with an ample stock of pro- visions allowed them by the Canadian Government. They were by this time in a very bad temper as many had staked all their possessions on this venture, and had started in the full belief that the British Government would assure and guarantee their admission to a land of plenty. This temper had been greatly aggravated by direct revolutionary influences....

"During the return voyage the War broke out. On hearing at Yokohama that his ship's company would not be allowed to land at Hong Kong, Gurdit Singh replied that they were perfectly willing to go to any port in India if provisions were supplied. The British Consul at Yokohama declined to meet his demands, which were exorbitant; but the consul at Kobe was more compliant, and after telegraphic communication between Japan and India, the Komagata Maru started for Calcutta. At neither Hong Kong nor Singapore were the passengers allowed to land. This added to their annoyance, as, according to the findings of the Committee, many had not wished to return to India at all."

The Committee found that most of the passengers were disposed to blame the Government of India for all their misfortunes. "It is well known," states the Report, "that the average Indian makes no distinction between the Government of the United Kingdom, that of Canada, and that of British India, or that of any colony. To him these authorities are all one and the same. And this view of the whole Komagata Maru business was to no means confined to the passengers on the ship. ;it inspired some Sikhs of the Punjab with the idea that the Government was biased against them; and it strengthened the hands of the Ghadr revolutionaries who were urging Sikhs abroad to return to India and join the mutiny which, they asserted, was about to begin. Numbers of emigrants listened to such calls and hastened back to India from Canada, the United States, the Philippines, Hong Kong and China."

We have given this extract to show the real cause of the growth of the revolutionary movement among the Sikhs. Let the reader omit, if he can, for a moment, all references to active revolutionary propaganda and he will find that the underlying cause of this trouble was economic. Why did the Sikhs want to emigrate to Canada? Why did they stake all their possessions on the venture? Why were they unwilling to return to India at all? Because the economic conditions at home were so bad and the prospects abroad so good.

At home their lands were not sufficient to absorb all their energies, the income was not sufficient to keep body and soul together and, in a majority of cases, what they made from land was hardly more than sufficient to pay Land Revenue to the

Government and interest to the money-lender. There was nothing to bind them to their homes except the love of home land and the domestic ties. These melted away in the presence of dire necessity. In extreme need they left their homes to make more money to be able to pay their debts, to redeem their lands, if possible to purchase more land and to make life bearable and tolerable. When they came in the open world they found insurmountable barriers between them and plenty. They had helped in making the empire; the empire had enough land for all her sons and daughters; men were urgently needed to bring land into cultivation and otherwise to develop the empire; men of other races and colours were not only welcome but were being induced to come and settle by offers of all kinds. They, and they alone, were unwelcome and barred.

Add to this the attitude and the record of the Punjab Government towards political agitation and political agitators, to use their own favorite expressions. The Punjab Government was the first to resuscitate the old Regulation III of 1818 for the purpose of scotching a legitimate agitation against an obnoxious legislative measure. A wise and sagacious Government would have dropped the legislation which it was eventually found necessary to veto to maintain peace. The deportations drove the seeds of unrest deeper. The other contributory causes may be thus summed up:

(1) The Punjab Government has been the most relentless of all local governments in India in suppressing freedom of speech and press.

(2) The Punjab Government at one time was very foolishly zealous in persecuting the Arya Samajists and in making a mountain out of a molehill about the letters found in the possession of Parmanand.

(3) The sentences which the Punjab Courts have passed in cases of seditious libel are marked by such brutality as to make them notably unique in the history of criminal administration in India.

(4) The strangulation of all open political life by direct and indirect repression led to the adoption of secret methods.

(5) The sentences passed in the Delhi Conspiracy case were much more severe than those given in Bengal in similar cases. In this case four men were hanged, two of them only because of membership in the secret conspiracy and not for actual participation in the outrage that was the subject of the charge, and two others were sentenced to seven years rigorous imprisonment each.

(6) The Budge-Budge riot and the considerable loss of life that resulted therefrom was another case of stupid management and utter incapacity to handle a delicate situation.

(7) For the Lahore Conspiracy 28 persons were hanged, and about 90 sentenced to long terms of imprisonment and transportation for life. But for the interference of Lord Hardinge the hangings would have exceeded 50. In addition some mutinous soldiers of two regiments were tried by Court Martial and a few murderous robbers and train-wreckers were dealt with by the ordinary courts. The reader may well compare this with the record of convictions relating to Bengal.

Now, we have not the slightest intention of justifying the conduct of those who conspired to overthrow the Government by force, or who committed murders, robberies or other offences in the furtherance of that design. In our judgment only madmen, ignorant of the conditions of their country, could have been guilty of such crimes. Nor are we inclined to blame the Government much for the sharp steps they took to preserve order and maintain their authority during the war . But, after all has been said, we must reiterate that the underlying causes were economic and were the direct result of Government policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION

The Committee has said all that it could against individual publicists, Indian public movements and the native press. They have found no fault with the Anglo-Indian press and the Government. The whole force of their judicial acumen has been applied in recommending fresh measures of repression and suppression which they have divided into two kinds: Punitive Measures, Permanent, (a) Points of General Application. The measures which we shall submit are of two kinds, viz., Punitive, by which term we mean measures better to secure the conviction

and punishment of offenders, and Preventive, i.e., measures to check the spread of conspiracy and the commission of crime. We may say at once that we do not expect very much from punitive measures. The conviction of offenders will never check such a movement as that which grew up in Bengal unless all the leaders can be convicted at the outset. Further, the real difficulties have been the scarcity of evidence due to various causes and the want of reliance whether justified or not, on such evidence as there has been. The last difficulty is fundamental and cannot be remedied. No law can direct a court to be convinced when it is not. Punitive Measures (Permanent). Legislation directed better to secure the punishment of seditious crime may take the shape either “

(a) of changes in the general law of evidence or procedure which if sound would be advisable in regard to all crime, or

(b) changes in the substantive law of sedition or modifications in the rules of evidence and procedure in such cases designed to deal with the special features of that class of offence.

The recommendation under (a) does not amount to much and we will not mention it. Under (b) they recommend: In the first place we think that a permanent enactment on the lines of Rule 25 A under the Defence of India Act is required. That rule provides for the punishment of persons having prohibited documents (which may have to be defined anew) in their possession or control with (as we read the effect of the words used) intent to publish or circulate them. . . . We also recommend that the principle of section 565 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (which provides for an order requiring notification of residence after release in the case of persons convicted a second time for certain offences) should be extended to all persons convicted of offences under Chapter VI of the Penal Code (offences against the State) whether previously convicted or not. Such persons might be ordered to give security for a period not exceeding two years for good behaviour so far as offences under Chapter VI are concerned, and in default be directed to notify their residence to Government, who should have power to restrict their movements for the period of two years after their release and prohibit them from addressing public

meetings, “ the term “ public meetings” including in its scope political subjects as in section 4 of the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act of 1907.

Lastly, we think that in all cases where there is a question of seditious intent, evidence of previous conviction for seditious crime or association (of an incriminating kind, of course) with persons so convicted should be admissible upon written notice to the accused with such particulars and at such a time before the evidence is given as might be fair. What we have called seditious crime would of course have to be accurately denned. Now it is evident that after such legislation all liberty of speech and action becomes extinct. These recommendations will we fear directly lead to secret propaganda and secret action. Under the head of emergency punitive measures the committee recommends:

> *Emergency Provisions for Trials. Coming now to the measures themselves, we are of opinion that provision should be made for the trial of seditious crime by Benches of three Judges without juries or assessors and without preliminary commitment proceedings or appeal. In short, the procedure we recommend should follow the lines laid down in sections 5-9 inclusive of the Defence of India Act. It should be made clear that section 512 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (relating to the giving in evidence under certain circumstances of depositions taken in the absence of an absconding accused) applies to these trials, it having, we understand, been questioned whether section 7 of the Defence of India Act has that effect. We think it necessary to exclude juries and assessors mainly because of the terrorism to which they are liable. But terrorism apart, we do not think that they can be relied upon in this class of cases. They are too much inclined to be affected by public discussion.*

We omit the detailed discussion of these provisions in which the committee has attempted to soften the sting of these recommendations by giving their reasons and by suggesting certain safeguards against their abuse. The most startling of their recommendations are however made under the head of emergency preventive measures.

Emergency Preventive Measures. We have been forced to the conclusion that it is necessary, in order to keep the conspiracies

already described under control in the future, to provide for the continuance after the expiry of the Defence of India Act (though in the contingent form explained and under important limitations) of some of the powers which that measure introduced in a temporary form. By those means alone has the conspiracy been paralysed for the present and we are unable to devise any expedient operating according to strict judicial forms which can be relied upon to prevent its reviving to check it if it does revive, or, in the last resort, to suppress it anew. This will involve some infringement of the rules normally safeguarding the liberty of the subject. We have endeavored to make that infringement as small as we think possible consistently with the production of an effective scheme.

Existing Temporary Powers. The powers at present temporarily possessed by the Government are so far as material for the present purpose to be found in rules 3-7 inclusive and 12A under the Defence of India Act, 1915. . We do not refer for the present to the Foreigners Ordinance, 1914, or the Ingress into India Ordinance, 1914. . . . Shortly stated, their effect is to give power to require persons by executive order to remain in any area to be specified or not to enter or remain in any such area, with penalties for breach of such requirements. These orders may be made and served on the person affected, whereupon they become binding upon him, or the person may be arrested without warrant and detained for a period not exceeding in all one month, pending an order of restriction. There is also a power of search under search warrant. It will be observed there is no pro- vision for an examination of the cases of such persons. The decision lies solely with the Local Government. There is also the power of confinement under Regulation III of 1818. Again: "Two Grades of Powers Desirable. " We now proceed to elaborate . . . the scheme we suggest. "We think, as we have already indicated, that the powers to be acquired should be of two grades capable of being called into operation separately, possibly under different forms of notification.

" The first group of powers should be of the following nature:" "(i) to demand security with or without sureties; " (ii) to restrict residence or to require notification of change of residence; " (iii) to require abstention from certain acts, such as engaging in journalism, distributing leaflets or attending meetings; " (iv) to require that the person should periodically report to the police.

"The second group of powers should be " "(i) to arrest; "(ii) to search under warrant; "(iii) to confine in non-penal custody. "In Article 196 they provide "that in respect of acts committed before the Defence of India Act expires (or an earlier date if preferred) and danger apprehended by reason of such acts in the future it should be lawful to proceed against any person under any of the pro- visions which we have outlined without any notification. In other words, the new law is to be deemed to be operative for that purpose immediately. "

Articles 198 and 199 suggest measures for restricting "Ingress into India" and also for regulating and restricting "Inter-Provincial Movements." Need it be said that if these recommendations are accepted there will be no liberty of press or speech in India and the Reform will fail to suppress the revolutionary movement at all. Indian opinion is unanimous in condemning these recommendations as has been proved by the unanimous opposition of all sections of Indians in the Viceroy's Legislative Council to the bills that have been introduced to give effect to them.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Revolution is a fever brought about by the constant and reckless disregard of the laws of health in the government of a country.

David Lloyd George

"Causes and Aims of the War." Speech delivered at Glasgow, on being presented with the freedom of that city, June 29, 1917.

The authors of the report remark:

> *" There exists a small revolutionary party deluded by hatred of British rule and desire for the elimination of the Englishman into the belief that the path to independence or constitutional liberty lies through anarchical crime. Now it may be that such persons will see for themselves the wisdom of abandoning methods which are as futile as criminal; though if they do not, the powers of the law are or can be made sufficient for the maintenance of order. But the existence of such people is a warning against the possible consequences of unrestrained agitation in India. We are*

justified in calling on the political leaders, in the work of education that they will under- take, to bear carefully in mind the political inexperience of their hearers; and to look for further progress not to fiery agitation which may have consequences quite beyond their grasp, but to the machinery which we devise for the purpose. In every country there will be persons who love agitation for agitation's sake or to whom it appeals like an intoxicant. It is the duty of the leaders of Indian opinion to remember the effect on people not accustomed to weighing words of fiery and heated speeches. Where ignorance is wide- spread and passions are so easily aroused, nothing is easier than for political leaders to excite a storm; nothing harder for them than to allay it. Breaches of the peace or crimes of violence only put back the political clock. Above all things, when the future of India depends upon co-operation among all races, attacks upon one race or religion or upon another jeopardise the whole experiment. Nor can the condemnation of extremist and revolutionary action be left only to the official classes. We call upon all those who claim to be leaders to condemn with us and to support us in dealing with methods of agitation which drive schoolboys to crime and lead to religious and agrarian disturbance. Now that His Majesty's Government have declared their policy, reasonable men have something which they can oppose successfully to the excitement created by attacks on Government and by abuse of Englishmen, coupled with glowing and inaccurate accounts of India's golden past and appeals to race hatred in the name of religion. Many prominent Indians dislike and fear such methods. A new opportunity is now being offered to combat them; and we expect them to take it. Disorder must be prejudicial to the cause of progress and especially disorder as a political weapon."

We are in general agreement with the sentiments expressed in this extract but we will be wanting in candour if we fail to point out that, though the revolutionary movement in India is mainly political, it is partly economic and partly anarchic also. In the first two aspects it is at present the product of purely local (Indian) conditions. In the last, it is the reaction of world forces. While we are hoping that the change in the policy, now announced, will remove the political basis of it, we are not quite sure that will

ensure the extermination of the party or the total destruction of the movement. The growth of democratic political institutions in India must inevitably be followed by a movement for social democracy. The spirit of Revolution which is now fed by political inequalities will, when these are removed, find its sustenance in social inequalities. That movement may not be anti- British; perhaps it will not be, but that it will have some revolutionary element in it may be assumed. The lessons of history make it clear that the most effective way to prevent its falling into channels of violence is to have as little recourse to coercion as may be consistent with the preservation of general order and peace. The preservation of order and the unhindered exercise of private rights by all citizens is the pre-requisite condition to good government. Every government must see to it. It is their duty to use preventive as well as punitive methods. There are, however, ways of doing these things. One is the British, the American and the French way. The other is what was heretofore associated with the name of the late Czar. The third is the German way. We hope the lessons of Czarism will not be lost on either party. The governments have as much to learn from it as the peoples. The best guarantee against the abnormal growth of a revolutionary movement is to adopt and follow the British methods and to avoid scrupulously and without fail any approach to the discredited Russian or Prussian methods. The Indian soil and the Indian atmosphere are not very congenial for revolutionary ideas and revolutionary methods. The people are too docile, gentle, law-abiding and spiritually inclined to take to them readily. They are by nature and tradition neither vindictive nor revengeful. Their general spirit is opposed to all kinds of violence. They have little faith in the virtues of force. Unless they are provoked, and that too terribly, and are face to face with serious danger they do not like the use of force, even when recourse to it may be legal and morally defensible.

One of the causes of the growth of the revolutionary movement in India has been the insolence and the incivility of the European Community towards the Indian Community. The charges of cowardice so often hurled against the Bengali have played no insignificant part in the genesis of the Bengal revolutionary. The distinguished authors have put it rather mildly:

"If there are Indians who really desire to see India leave the empire, to get rid of English officers and English commerce, we believe that among their springs of action will be found the bitterness of feeling that has been nurtured out of some manifestation that the Englishman does not think the Indian an equal. Very small seeds casually thrown may result in great harvests of political calamity. We feel that, particularly at the present stage of India's progress, it is the plain duty of every Englishman and woman, official and non-official, in India to avoid the offence and the blunder of discourtesy: and none the less is it incumbent on the educated Indian to cultivate patience and a more generous view of what may very likely be no more than heedlessness or difference of custom."

We admire the dignified way in which they have addressed their advice to the educated Indian. But we hope they do not ignore that except in a few scattered instances heretofore the chief fault has lain with the ruling class. The proceedings of the Royal Commission on the Public Services of India are full of that racial swagger which the authors of this report have mildly condemned in the above extract and it is an open secret that that spirit was one of the dearly cherished articles of faith with the bureaucracy. We hope the war has effected a great change in their temper and both parties will be disposed to profit from the advice given to them in the report. As to the duty of the educated leaders in the matter of suppressing the growth of the revolutionary movement in future, we beg to point out that all depends on how much faith the governing classes place in the professions of the popular leaders. Open public speeches and meetings appealing to racial or religious animosities have not played any important part in the development of the revolutionary spirit. It is not likely that the educated leaders will in any way consciously and voluntarily digress from the limits of reasonable criticism of Government policy, nor have they very often done so in the past. What has so far prevented the educated leaders from exercising an effective check on the growth of the revolutionary movement is their inability to associate on terms of friendship with the younger generation. This has been due partly to a false idea of dignity and partly to the fear that any association with hot-headed young men

might bring discredit on them or might land them in hot water if, sometime or other, any one of their friends might do anything violent. Public speeches denouncing the revolutionary propaganda and the revolutionary activities or public condemnation of the latter in the press are good in their own way, but they are not quite effective. The revolutionist may ascribe it to fear, timidity, or hypocrisy. What is needed is that educated leaders of influence should be free to mix, socially and otherwise, with the younger generation so as to acquire an intimate knowledge of their trend of thought and bent of mind. It is in these intimate exchanges of views that they can most effectively exercise their powers of argument and persuasion and use their influence effectively. They will not succeed always, but in a good many cases they will. This cannot be done, however, unless the Executives and the Police relax their attentions toward them.

The bureaucrats' want of confidence in any Indian leader reached its limit in the attentions which the agents of the secret service bestowed on such men as the late Mr. Gokhale. It is an open secret that the secret service records have assigned a particular number to every public leader in India. Religious preachers and teachers of the type of Lala Hansraj and Lala Munshi Ram receive as much attention in the records as the writer of this book or Mr., B. G. Tilak or Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. The " Servants of India" are as much the objects of solicitation on the part of the secret service men as the members of the Arya Samaj. Of course, agitators are agitators. All the great progressive souls of the world have had to agitate at one time or another in their lives. Agitation is the soul of democracy. There can be no progress in a democracy without agitation. Sir Denzil Ibbetson could pay no greater compliment to the Arya Samaj than by his remark in 1907 that, according to his information, wherever there was an Arya Samaj it was a centre of unrest. We hope the Governments are now convinced that the Arya Samaj has never been revolutionary. It is one of the most conservative, restraining forces in the social life of the country. Yet it cannot be denied that its propaganda has been and will continue to be one of the most disturbing factors in the placid waters of Indian life. The bureaucracy could not look upon it with kindness. Any attempt to persist in this kind of control or check or persecution

will be fatal to the success of the appeal which Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have addressed to the public men of India in the extract given above. In our judgment the most effective way to check the growth of the revolutionary movement is by freeing the mind of the leaders of the fear of being misunderstood if they should mix freely with the younger generation and yet fail to prevent some of them from becoming revolutionists. A revolutionary prospers on exclusiveness. Secrecy is his great ally. Cut off a young man from open, healthy influences and he will be attracted by the mystery of secrecy. Thence- forth he is doomed. After that he may be weaned only by kindness and friendliness and not by threats or persecution. Most of the youths attracted by revolutionary propaganda have proved to be quite ignorant of the real conditions of their country. No attempt has been made to instruct them in politics. They have been fed on unsound history and unsound politics. Reactionary Imperialism has harmed them more than exaggerated nationalism. They have had few opportunities of discussion with people who could look upon things in right perspective.

They could not open their minds to their European teachers. In the few cases in which they did they repented. Somehow or other, the free confidential talks they had with their professors found an entry in the police records. It brought a black mark against their names, to stand and mar their careers forever. The Indian teacher and professor is afraid of discussing politics with them. So they go on unrestrained until the glamour of prospective heroism, by a deed of violence, fascinates one of them and he is led into paths of crimes of a most detestable kind. Unscrupulous advisors lead him toward falsehood, hypocrisy, treachery, treason and crime by dubious methods. One of the things they preach is that morality has nothing to do with politics.

They insinuate that the violence of militarism and Imperialism can be effectively met and checked only by violence. Poor misguided souls! They enforce their advice by the diplomatic history of Europe. They forget that once a youth is led into the ways of falsehood and unscrupulousness he may as easily use it against his friends as against his enemies. If he has no scruples about killing an enemy he may have none about killing a friend.

If he has no scruples about betraying the one, he may have none about betraying the other. Once a man starts toward moral degeneration, even for desirable or patriotic ends, there is no knowing whither his course might take him. The most idealistic young men starting with the highest and purest conceptions of patriotism have been known to fall into the most ignoble methods of attacking first their enemies and then their friends. When they reach that stage of moral corruption they can trust no one, can believe in the honesty of no one. Their one idea of cleverness and efficiency is to conceal their motives from everyone, to give their confidence to no one, to suspect and distrust everyone and to aspire toward the success that consists in imposing upon all.

The remedy against this lies in encouraging an open and frank discussion of politics on the part of the younger generation, with such indulgences as are due to their youth and immaturity of judgment; a systematic teaching of political history in schools and colleges; a free and open intercourse with their teachers on the clearest understanding that nothing said in discussion or in confidence will ever be used either privately or publicly against them, and an equally free and intimate intercourse with the leaders of thought and of public life in the country. These latter must be freed from the attentions of the secret service if it is intended that they should effectually cooperate in counteracting revolutionary propaganda. Besides, the younger generation must be brought up in habits of manly and open encounter with their adversaries, in a spirit of sport and fair play. Repression, suppression, and suspicion do not provide a congenial climate for the development of these habits and they should be subordinated as much as possible in the present condition of chaotic conflict between social interests and social ideals.

EDUCATION

In the previous chapters we have embodied and discussed the important parts of the Report of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford. In this chapter we give a summary of what they say about education. The statements of fact made by the two distinguished statesmen are so lucid and fair that we make no apology for copying the whole article embodying the same.

"There is, however, one aspect of the general problem of political advance which is so important as to require notice in some detail. We have observed already that one of the greatest obstacles to India's political development lies not only in the lack of education among its peoples taken as a whole, but also in the uneven distribution of educational advance. The educational policy of Government has incurred much criticism from different points of view. Government is charged with neglect, because after sixty years of educational effort only 6 per cent, of the population is literate, while under 4 per cent, of the total population is undergoing instruction. It is charged, on the other hand, with having given to those classes which welcomed instruction a system which is divorced from their needs in being purely literary, in admitting methods of unintelligent memorising and of cramming, and in producing, far in excess of the actual demands of Indian conditions, a body of educated young men whose training has prepared them only for Government service or the practice of law. The system of university education on Western lines is represented as cutting off the students from the normal life of the country, and the want of connection between primary education in the vernaculars and higher education in English is regarded as another radical defect."

The period of sixty years mentioned is evidently counted from 1858, the year in which the rule of the East India Company ceased and the Crown assumed direct responsibility for the Government of India. British rule in India however began in 1757 a.d. and the foundation of public education in India under the British might well be considered to have been laid by Warren Hastings in 1781, in which year the Calcutta Madrassa was established. For a period of almost 50 years the discussion whether the Indians should be instructed in English or not went on until it was settled in 1835 by Lord Macaulay's famous minute in favour of English and the European system. In 1824 there were 14 public institutions in Bengal imparting education on Western lines. In the same year, i.e., in 1824, Monstuart Elphinstone formulated a similar policy for the Bombay presidency. To the remarks made in the above quotation about the extent and kind of education imparted in India till now, the distinguished authors of the report add: "From the economic point of view India had been handicapped by the want of professional and technical instruction: her colleges turn out numbers of young men qualified for Government clerkships while the real interests of the country require, for example, doctors and engineers in excess of the existing supply. The charge that Government has produced a large intelligentsia which cannot find employment has much substance in it: it is one of the facts that lie at the root of recent political difficulties. But it is only of late years and as part of the remarkable awakening of national self-consciousness, that the complaint has been heard that the system has failed to train Indians for practical work in manufactures, commerce, and the application of science to industrial life." After making a few general observations on the so called difficulties in the way of a general spread of education "the chief needs at present" are thus pointed out: "Primary education, as we have seen, is already practically in the hands of local bodies, but secondary education was deliberately left at the outset almost entirely to private agencies. The universities, despite their connection with Government, are largely non- official bodies with extensive powers. The main defect of the system is probably the want of co-ordination between primary and higher education, which in turn reacts upon the efficiency of the secondary institutions and to a great extent confines university colleges to the unsatisfactory function of mere finishing schools. The universities have suffered from having been allowed to drift into the position of institutions that are expected not so much to educate in the true sense as to provide the student with the means of entering an official or a professional career.

Thus a high percentage of failures seems to a large body of Indian opinion not so much a proof of the faultiness of the methods of teaching as an example of an almost capricious refusal of the means of obtaining a living wage to boys who have worked for years often at the cost of real hardship to secure an independent livelihood. The educational wastage is everywhere excessive; and analysis shows that it is largely due to under- payment and want of proper training in the case of teachers. The actual recruits for normal schools are too often ill-prepared, and the teaching career, which in India used formerly to command respect, does not now offer adequate inducements to men of ability and force of character. The first need, therefore, is the improvement of teaching. Until that is attained it is vain to expect that the continuation of studies

from the primary stage can be made attractive. But while the improvement of primary and middle schools is the first step to be taken, very much remains to be done in reorganising the secondary teachers and ensuring for the schoolmaster a career that will satisfy an intelligent man. The improvement of ordinary secondary education is obviously a necessary condition for the development of technical instruction and the reform of the university system. It is clear that there is much scope for an efficient and highly trained inspectorate in stimulating the work of the secondary schools and in helping the inspectorate of the primary schools maintained by the local bodies. We believe that the best minds in India, while they feel that the educational service has not in the past been widely enough opened to Indians trained at British universities, value the maintenance of a close connection with educationists from the United Kingdom.

"This survey of educational problems will show how much room there is for advance and improvement, and also how real the difficulties are. The defects of the present system have often been discussed in the legislative councils, but, as was inevitable so long as the councils had no responsibility, without due appreciation of financial difficulties, or serious consideration of the question how far fresh taxation for educational improvement would be acceptable. As we shall show, it is part of the political advance that we contemplate that the direction of Indian education should be increasingly transferred to Indian hands. Only so, we believe, can the stimulus be forthcoming which will enable the necessary money to be found.

The weak points are recognised. A real desire for improvement exists. Educational extension and reform must in- evitably play an important part in the political progress of the country. We have already made clear our conviction that political capacity can come only through the exercise of political responsibility; and that mere education without opportunities must result in serious mischief. But there is another important element. Progress must depend on the growth of electorates and the intelligent exercise of their powers; and men will be immensely helped to become competent electors by acquiring such education as will enable them to judge candidates for their votes, and of the business done in the councils. No one would propose to prescribe an educational qualification for the

vote; but no one can deny the practical difficulties which make a very general extension of the franchise impossible, until literacy is far more widely spread than is the case at present Progress was temporarily interrupted by uncertainty as to the distribution of financial resources which would result from the constitutional changes; but the imminence of these has given a new importance to the question and its consideration has been resumed. We trust that impetus will thus be given to a widespread movement which will be taken up and carried forward boldly by the reformed councils." The subject has been so fairly dealt with, the defects of the present system so frankly recognised and the need of wider dissemination of education so forcibly explained that we need add nothing. In our judgment the circumstances and conditions under which it is proposed to transfer the direction of Indian education to Indian hands are extremely unfair. It is admitted that under the present economic conditions of the Indian people, there is little scope for further taxation. If so, there are only two ways to find money for education, (a) by economy in the other departments of public administration, (b) by loans.

The recommendation made by the Secretary of State and the Viceroy for an increase in the emoluments of the European services hardly leaves any room for (a). We have discussed the matter at some length in another chapter. The only other source left, then, is by incurring debt. Education is so important and so fundamental to the future progress of the country that in our judgment the ministers should feel no hesitation in having recourse to it, but the problem is so gigantic that, lacking material reduction in the cost of administration in other departments, it will be extremely difficult to meet the situation without an unreasonable increase in the public debt. Anyway, under the scheme recommended, the Government cannot divest itself of the fullest responsibility in the matter. The scheme gives no vital power to the I electorates or their representatives. The authority of the Executive in the matter of appropriations remains unaffected and so long as it retains the final say in the making of the Budget, the Indian ministers cannot, handicapped by so many restrictions, be held responsible if the progress is slow. Our views on the problem of education in India have been expressed in a separate book to which interested readers are referred. 2 We hold that it is the duty of the Government to

provide free and wholesome education to every child at public cost, that education should be compulsory up to the age of 18. The policy of the English Education Act of 1918 ought to be applied to India, and if it cannot be done from current funds, loans should be raised for the purpose. It is a matter which brooks of no delay. The whole future of India depends upon it. Nay, the future of humanity as a whole is affected by it. The world cannot be safe for any kind of democracy, nor can the world make progress towards a better order without the active cooperation of three hundred and fifteen million Indians forming one-fifth of the human race. Not only is the world poorer by reason of India's inability to cooperate in the work of progress but its present educational backwardness is a serious handicap to the rest of humanity going forward.

THE PROBLEM

We have so far discussed the Report and such re- marks as we have made have been by way of comment. In this chapter we propose to give in brief outline our own view of the problem.

Let us first be clear about the exact nature of the Indian problem. Political institutions are, after all, only a reflection of the national mind and of national conditions. What is the end? The end is freedom to live and to live according to our own conception of what life should be, to pursue our own ideals, to develop our own civilization and to secure that unity of purpose which would distinguish us from the other nations of the world, insuring for us a position of independence and honor, of security from within and non-interference from without. We have no ambition to conquer and rule other peoples; we have no desire to exploit foreign markets; not even to impose our "kultur" and our "civilization" on others. At present we are counted among the backward peoples of the earth mainly because we are a subject people, governed by a foreign power, protected by foreign bayonets and schooled by foreign teachers.

The condition of our masses is intellectually deplorable and economically miserable; our women are still in bondage and do not enjoy that freedom which their Western sisters have won; our domestic masters, the prince and priest, are still in saddle; caste and privilege still hold some sway, yet it is not true that, taken

all in all, we are really a backward people. Even in these matters we find that the difference between us and the "advanced" nations of the world is one of degree only. Caste and privilege rule in the United States as much as in India. There is nothing in our history which can be put on the same level as the lynching of Mr. Little, the deportation of Bisbee miners, the lynching of the Negroes, and other incidents of a similar nature indicative of race I hatred and deep rooted colour prejudice.

No nation in the world can claim an ideal state of society , in which everything is of the best. On the other hand, there are certain matters in which comparison is to our advantage. Even with the advance of drunkenness under British rule we are yet a sober nation; our standards of personal and domestic hygiene are much higher than those of the Western people; our standards of life much simpler and nobler; our social ideals more humane; and our spiritual aspirations infinitely superior. As a nation we do not believe in war or militarism or evangelism.

We do not force our views on others; we have greater toleration for other people's opinions and beliefs than has any other nation in the world; we have not yet acquired that craze for possessions and for sheer luxurious and riotous life which marks the modern Pharisee of the West. Our people, according to their conceptions, means and opportunities are kindly, hospitable, gentle, law-abiding, mutually helpful, full of respect for others, and peace loving. It is, in fact, the abnormal extent in which these qualities exist that has contributed to our political and economic exploitation by others. In India capitalism and landlordism have not yet developed as fully as they have among the civilized nations of the West. The West is in revolt against capitalism and landlordism. We do not claim that before the advent of the British there was no capitalism or landlordism in India. But we do contend that, though there was a certain amount of rivalry and competition between the different castes, within the castes there was much more cooperation and fellow-feeling than there has ever been in the West. Our native governments and their underlings, the landlords, did exact a high price from the village communities for the privilege of cultivating their lands but within the village there was no inter se competition either between the tillers of the soil or between the pursuers of crafts. The gulf between the rich and

the poor was not so marked as it is today in the West. Under the British rule and since its introduction, however, things have changed considerably. Without adopting the best features of modern life, we have been forced by circumstances, political and economic, to give up the best of our own. Village communities have been destroyed; joint and corporate bargaining has given place to individual transactions; every bit of land has been separately measured, marked and taxed; common lands have been divided; the price of land and rent has risen abnormally. The money- lender who, before the advent of British rule, held an extremely subordinate position in the village community, has suddenly come to occupy the first place. He owns the best lands and the best houses and holds the bodies and souls of the agriculturalists in mortgage. The villages which were generally homogeneous in population, bound to each other by ties of race, blood and religion, have become heterogeneous, with nondescript people of all races and all religions who have acquired land by purchase. Competition has taken the place of cooperation.

A country where social cooperation and social solidarity reigned at least within castes, within villages and within urban areas has been entirely disrupted and disintegrated by unlimited and uncontrolled competition. India never knew any poor laws; she never needed any; nor orphan asylums, nor old age pensions and widow homes. She had no use for organized charity. Rarely did any man die for want of food or clothing, except in famines. Hospitality was open and was dispensed under a sense of duty and obligation and not by way of charity or kindness. The survival of the fittest had no hold on our minds. We had no factories or workshops. People worked in their own homes or shops either with their own money or with money borrowed from the money-lender. The artisans were the masters of the goods they produced and, unless otherwise agreed with the money-lender, sold them in the open market. The necessities of life, being cheap and easily procurable the artisans cared more for quality than quantity. Their work was a source of pleasure and pride as well as of profit to them. Now everything has, gone, pleasure, pride, as well as profit. Where profit has remained, pleasure and pride are gone. We are on the high road to a " distinctly industrial civilization." In fact, the principal complaint of our political reformers and free trade

economists is that the British Government has not let us proceed on that road at a sufficiently rapid pace and that, in preventing us, they have been dominated by their own national interests more than by our own good. We saw that other nations were progressing by following the laws of industrial development, and quite naturally we also wanted to prosper by the same method. This war has opened our eyes as it has opened those of the rest of the world and we have begun to feel that the goal that we sought leads to perdition and not salvation. This makes it necessary for the Indian politicians and economists to review their ideas of political progress. What are we aiming at? Do we want to rise, in order to fall? Do we want to copy and emulate Europe even in its mistakes and blunders? Does the road to heaven lie through hell? Must we make a wreck of our ship and then try salvage?

The civilization of Europe, as we have known it, is dying. It may take decades or perhaps a century or more to die. But die it must. This War has prepared a death bed for it from which it will never rise. Upon its ruins is rising, or will rise, another civilization which will reproduce much of what was valuable and precious in our own with much of what we never had. The question that we want to put to our compatriots is, shall we prepare ourselves for the coming era, or shall we bury ourselves in the debris of the expiring one. We have no right to answer it for others, but our answer is clear and unequivocal. We will not be a party to any scheme which shall add to the powers of the capitalist and the landlord and will introduce and accentuate the evils of the expiring industrial civilization into our beloved country.

We are not unaware that, according to the judgment of some thinkers, amongst them Karl Marx, a country must pass through the capitalistic mill, before the proletariat comes to its own. We do not believe in the truth of this theory, but even if it be true we will not consciously help in proving it to be true. The existing social order of Europe is vicious and immoral. It is worm eaten. It has the germs of plague, disease, ' death and destitution in it. It is in a state of decomposition. It is based on injustice, tyranny, oppression and class rule. Certain phases of if are inherent in our own system. Certain others we are borrowing from our masters in order to make a complete mess. Wisdom and foresight require that we be forewarned. What we want and what we need is not

the power to implant in full force and in full vigour the expiring European system, but power to keep out its development on vicious lines, with opportunities of gradually and slowly undoing the evil that has already been done. The Government of India as at present constituted is a Government of capitalists and landlords, of both) England and India. Under the proposed scheme the power of the former will be reduced and that of the latter increased. The Indo-British Association does not like it, not because it loves the masses of India for which it hypocritically and insincerely professes solicitude, but because in their judgment it reduces the profits of the British governing classes. We doubt if the scheme really does affect even that. But if it does, it is good so far.

The ugly feature of the scheme is not its potentiality in transferring the power into the hands of the Brahmins (the power of the Brahmin as such, is gone for good), but in the possibility of its giving too much power to the " profiteering " class, be they the land- lords of Bengal and Oudh, or the millionaires of Bombay. The scheme protects the European merchants; it confers special privileges on the small European Community; it provides special representation for the landlords, the Chambers of Commerce, the Mohammedans and the Sikhs. What is left for the general tax-paying public is precious little. The authors of the scheme say that to withhold complete and immediate Home Rule is in the interest of the general masses, the poor inarticulate ryot and the workingman. We wish we could believe in it. We wish it were true. Perhaps they mean it, but our past experience does not justify our accepting it at its face value.

There is, however, one thing we can do. We can ask them for proofs by insisting on and agitating for the immediate legislative relief of the ryot and the middle classes. We should adopt the aims of the British Labour Party as our own, start educating our people on those lines and formulate measures which will secure for them real freedom and not the counterfeit coin which passes for it. It will require years of education and agitation but it has to be done, no matter whether we are ruled by the British or by our own property holders. We are not opposed to Home Rule. Nay, we press for it. In our judgment the objections urged against giving it at once are flimsy and intangible. The chief obstacles are such as have been created or perpetuated by the British themselves.

The caste does not prevent us from having at least as much home rule as is enjoyed by the people of Italy, Hungary, the Balkan States and some of the South American Republics. But if we cannot have it at once and if the British must retain the power of final decision in their hands, we must insist upon something being immediately done not only to educate the ryot but to give him economic relief. So long as the British continue to refuse to do that we must hold them responsible for all the misery that Indian humanity is suffering from. We want political power in order to raise the intellectual and political status of our masses. We do not want to bolster up classes. Our goal is real liberty, equality and opportunity for all. We want to avoid, j if possible, the evils of the class struggle. We will pass through the mill if we must, but we should like to try to avoid it. For that reason we want freedom to legislate and freedom to determine our fiscal arrangements. That is our main purpose in our demand for Home Rule.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASPECT

Thus far we have discussed the Indian question from the internal or national point of view. But it has an international aspect also. It is said, and we hope that it is true, that the world is entering into an era of new internationalism and that the old exclusive chauvinistic nationalism is in its last gasps. This war was the greatest social mix-up known to history. It has brought about the downfall of many monarchs and the destruction of four empires. The armies of the belligerents on both sides contained the greatest assortment of races and nations, of religions and languages that were ever brought together for mutual destruction. Primarily a fight between the European Christians, it drew into its arena Hindus, Mohammedans, Buddhists, Shintos, Jews and Negroes of Africa and America. The war has produced a revolution in Russia, the like of which has never been known. It is now said openly that the Russian Revolution had as much influence on the final debacle of the Central Powers as the strength of the Allies and the resources of America. The revolution has spread to Germany and Austria and threatens to engulf the whole of Europe. It has given birth to a new order of society, aglow with the spirit of a new and elevated kind of internationalism.

This internationalism must have for its foundation justice and self-determination for all peoples, regardless of race or religion, creed or color. In the new under- standing between nations cooperation must be substituted for competition and mutual trust and helpfulness for distrust and exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. The only alternatives are reaction, with the certainty of even greater war in the near future, and Bolshevism.Now, nobody knows what Bolshevism represents. The Socialists themselves are divided over it. The advanced wing is enthusiastic, the moderates are denouncing it. The Liberals and Radicals are freely recognizing that it has brought into the affairs of men a new spirit which is going to stay and substantially influence the future of the world. The stand-patters denounce it in the strongest possible terms. They calumniate it to their heart's content and move heaven and earth to exterminate it. But we feel that only radical changes in the existing order will stem its tide. The Socialists and Radicals want to make the most of it, while the Imperialist Liberals and Conservatives want to give as little as is compatible with the safety of the existing order in which they are supreme. The struggle will take some time, but that it will end in favor of the new spirit no one doubts.

The only way to meet Bolshevism is to concede rights to the different peoples of the earth, now being bled and exploited. Otherwise the discontented and exploited countries of the world will be the best breeding centres for it. India must come into her own soon, else not even the Himalayas can effectually bar the entry of Bolshevism into India. A contented, self-governing India may be proof against it; a discontented, dissatisfied, oppressed India perhaps the most fertile field. We hope the British statesmen are alive to the situation.

But that is not the only way to look at the inter- national importance of India. By its geographical situation it is the connecting link between the Near East and the Far East and the clearing house for the trade of the world. Racially, it holds the balance between the European Aryan and the yellow races. In any military conflict between the white and the yellow races, the people of India will be a decisive factor. In a conflict of peace they will be a harmonising element. Racially they are the kin of the European. By religion and culture they are nearer the Chinese and

Japanese. With 70 million Moslems India is the most important centre of Mohammedan sentiment. With Christians as their present rulers, the Hindus and Mohammedans of India are coming to realise that their best interests require a closing up of their ranks. There is no doubt that, come what may, their relations in future will be much more cordial, friendly and mutually sympathetic than they have been in the past. The Hindus will stand by their Mohammedan countrymen in all their efforts to revive the glory of Islam, and to regain political independence for it. There is no fear of a Pan-Islamic movement if the new spirit of internationalism prevails. If, however, it does not, the Pan-Islamic movement might find a sympathetic soul in India. Islam is not dead. It cannot and will not die. The only way to make it a force for harmony and peace is to recognise its potentialities and to respect its susceptibilities. The political independence of Islamic countries is the basic foundation for such a state. We hope that the statesmen of the world will give their most earnest thought to the question and sincerely put into practice the principles they have been enunciating during the war. The case of India will be an acid test.

A happy India will make a valuable contribution to the evolution of a better and more improved humanity. An unhappy India will clog the wheels of progress. It will not be easy for the masters of India to rule it on old lines. If not reconciled it might prove the pivot of the next war. A happy India will be one of the brightest spots in the British Commonwealth. A discontented India will be a cause of standing shame and a source of never ending trouble.

With a republican China in the northeast, a constitutional Persia in the northwest and a Bolshevist Russia in the not remote north, it will be extremely foolish to attempt to rule India despotically. Not even the gods can do it. It is not possible even if the legislature devotes all its sittings to the drafting and passing of one hundred coercion acts. The peace of the world, international harmony and goodwill, the good name of the British Commonwealth, the safety of the Empire as such, demand the peaceful introduction and development of democracy in India.

3

Bose and India's Independence Struggle

When one thinks of the Indian independence movement in the 1930s and early 1940s, two figures most readily come to mind: Mahatma Gandhi, the immensely popular and "saintly" frail pacifist, and his highly respected, Fabian Socialist acolyte, Jawaharlal Nehru. Less familiar to Westerners is Subhash Chandra Bose, a man of comparable stature who admired Gandhi but despaired at his aims and methods, and who became a bitter rival of Nehru. Bose played a very active and prominent role in India's political life during most of the 1930s. For example, he was twice (1938 and 1939) elected President of the Indian National Congress, the country's most important political force for freedom from the *Raj*, or British rule.

While his memory is still held in high esteem in India, in the West Bose is much less revered, largely because of his wartime collaboration with the Axis powers. Both before and during the Second World War, Bose worked tirelessly to secure German and Japanese support in freeing his beloved homeland of foreign rule. During the final two years of the war, Bose—with considerable Japanese backing—led the forces of the Indian National Army into battle against the British.

IDEOLOGY OF FUSION

As early as 1930—in his inaugural speech as mayor of Calcutta—the fervent young Bose first expressed his support for a fusion of socialism and fascism: "... I would say we have here

in this policy and programme a synthesis of what modern Europe calls Socialism and Fascism. We have here the justice, the equality, the love, which is the basis of Socialism, and combined with that we have the efficiency and the discipline of Fascism as it stands in Europe today."

In years that followed, the brilliant, eclectic Bengali would occasionally modify this radical doctrine, but would never abandon it entirely. For example, in late 1944—almost a decade-and-a-half later—in a speech to students at Tokyo University, he asserted that India must have a political system "of an authoritarian character... To repeat once again, our philosophy should be a synthesis between National Socialism and Communism."

In the wake of the crushing defeat in 1945 of Hitler and Mussolini, "fascism" has arguably been the most despised of all political ideologies. Postwar western society recognizes no fascist heroics, and even considers "fascist" traits—particularly the authoritarian, charismatic, personal style of leadership, and the positive evaluation of violence and the willingness to use it for political purposes—to be decidedly unpalatable. In India, though, Bose is regarded as a national hero, in spite of his repeated praise (as will be shown) for autocratic leadership and authoritarian government, and admiration for the European fascist regimes with which he allied himself. Like the leaders he admired in Italy and Germany, Bose was (and still is) popularly known as *Netaji*, or "revered leader." "His name," explains Mihir Bose (no relation), one of Subhas' many biographers, "is given [in India] to parks, roads, buildings, sports stadiums, artificial lakes; his statues stand in place of those of discarded British heroes and his photograph adorns thousands of calendars and millions of *pan* (betel-nut) shops." It is always the same portrait, continues the writer: Bose in his Indian National Army uniform, "exhorting his countrymen forward to one last glorious struggle."

No less a figure than Gandhi paid tribute to Bose's remarkable courage and devotion. Six months after his death in an airplane crash on August 18, 1945, Gandhi declared: "The hypnotism of the Indian National Army has cast its spell upon us. Netaji's name is one to conjure with. His patriotism is second to none... His bravery shines through all his actions. He aimed high and failed.

But who has not failed." On another occasion Gandhi eulogized: "Netaji will remain immortal for all time to come for his service to India."

Many of Bose's admirers have been inclined to downplay or even ignore the fascist elements in his ideology, and even to pretend they never existed. For example, the text of Bose's inaugural speech as mayor of Calcutta, cited above, was reprinted in a laudatory 1970 "Netaji Birthday Supplement" of the *Calcutta Municipal Gazette*, but with all references to fascism, including his support for a synthesis of fascism and socialism, carefully deleted. Several admiring biographers have found it easier to ignore the fascist elements in his ideology than to explain them. Their subjective accounts do not even inform the reader that Bose spoke positively about some features of fascism, or else, in an attempt to remove from their hero any possible taint, they qualify his remarks in ways that he himself did not. 'Fascist'?

During his lifetime, Bose was frequently denounced as a fascist or even a Nazi, particularly in the wake of the radical, revolutionary (as opposed to reformist) views he expressed in radio addresses broadcast to India from National Socialist Germany and, later, from quasi-fascist Japan. For example, *The Statesman*, a highly influential Calcutta periodical, charged in November 1941: "Mr. Bose's views are those of the Nazis, and he makes no secret of it," while the BBC, Britain's worldwide radio voice, frequently accused him of "Fascism" and "Nazism."

Additionally, historians and writers who do not admire Bose readily point up his "fascist" views. A.M. Nair, a historian who has written favourably of Indian revolutionary Rash Behari Bose (who had sought Japan's help during and after the First World War), found nothing to praise about Subhash Chandra Bose. After all, wrote Nair, he was clearly a fascist.

RECOGNIZED LEADERSHIP

Bose, a patriot of almost fanatical zeal, first joined the Indian national movement in 1921, working under C.R. Das, whom he idolized. He was jailed for six months in 1921-1922 because of his political activities. Immediately upon his release, the 25-year-old Bose organized (and presided over) the All-Bengal Young Men's Conference. As a result of his remarkable leadership abilities and ambition, he advanced quickly through nationalist ranks. He was soon elected General Secretary of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee (BPCC). In 1924, at the age of 27, Bose was elected the Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Municipal Corporation, which effectively put him in charge of the second-largest city in the British empire. As a result of his close ties with nationalist terrorists, in late 1924 he was detained by British authorities and held, without trial, for three years in prison. In 1928, the 31-year-old Bose was elected president of the BPCC, and, at the Calcutta meeting of the Congress party held that December, he came to national prominence by pressing (unsuccessfully) for the adoption by his provincial committee of an independence resolution.

By 1930 Bose had formulated the broad strategy that he believed India must follow to throw off the yoke of British imperialism and assume its rightful place as a leader in Asia. During his years in Mandalay prison and another short term of imprisonment in Alipore jail in 1930, he read many works on political theory, including Francesco Nitti's *Bolshevism, Fascism and Democracy* and Ivanoe Bonomi's *From Socialism to Fascism*. It is clear that these works on fascism influenced him, and caused an immediate modification of his long-held socialist views: as noted above, in his inaugural speech as mayor of Calcutta, given a day after his release from Alipore jail, he revealed his support for a seemingly contradictory ideological synthesis of socialism and fascism. Until his death 15 years later, Bose would continue publicly to praise certain aspects of fascism and express his hope for a synthesis of that ideology and socialism. His detailed comments on the matter in his book *The Indian Struggle: 1920-1934*, which was first published in 1935, accurately represent the views he held throughout most of his career. As such, the most important of them, along with Bose's own actions, will be analyzed here in some detail.

PROGRAM OUTLINED

Contending that the Indian National Congress was somewhat "out of date," and suffered from a lack of unity and strong leadership, Bose predicted in *The Indian Struggle* that out of a

"Left-Wing revolt there will ultimately emerge a new full-fledged party with a clear ideology, programme and plan of action." The programme and plan of action of this new party would, wrote Bose, follow this basic outline:

1. The party will stand for the interests of the masses, that is, of the peasants, workers, etc., and not for the vested interests, that is, the landlords, capitalists and moneylending classes.
2. It will stand for the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people.
3. It will stand for a Federal Government for India as the ultimate goal, but will believe in a strong Central Government with dictatorial powers for some years to come, in order to put India on her feet.
4. It will believe in a sound system of state-planning for the reorganization of the agricultural and industrial life of the country.
5. It will seek to build up a new social structure on the basis of the village communities of the past, that were ruled by the village "Panch" and will strive to break down the existing social barriers like caste.
6. It will seek to establish a new monetary and credit system in the light of the theories and the experiments that have been and are current in the modern world.
7. It will seek to abolish landlordism and introduce a uniform land-tenure system for the whole of India.
8. It will not stand for a democracy in the Mid-Victorian sense of the term, but will believe in government by a strong party bound together by military discipline, as the only means of holding India together and preventing a chaos, when Indians are free and are thrown entirely on their own resources.
9. It will not restrict itself to a campaign inside India but will resort to international propaganda also, in order to strengthen India's case for liberty, and will attempt to utilize the existing international organizations.

10. It will endeavour to unite all the radical organizations under a national executive so that whenever any action is taken, there will be simultaneous activity on many fronts.

Synthesis

Bose went on to note that Nehru had said in 1933: "I dislike Fascism intensely and indeed I do not think it is anything more than a crude and brutal effort of the present capitalist order to preserve itself at any cost." There is no middle road between Fascism and Communism, said Nehru, so one "had to choose between the two and I choose the Communist ideal."

To this Bose responded:

> *"The view expressed here is, according to the writer, fundamentally wrong... One is inclined to hold that the next phase in world-history will produce a synthesis between Communism and Fascism. And will it be a surprise if that synthesis in produced in India?... In spite of the antithesis between Communism and Fascism, there are certain traits in common. Both Communism and Fascism believe in the supremacy of the State over the individual. Both denounce parliamentary democracy. Both believe in party rule. Both believe in the dictatorship of the party and in the ruthless suppression of all dissenting minorities. Both believe in a planned industrial reorganization of the country. These common traits will form the basis of the new synthesis. That synthesis is called by the writer "Samyavada"—an Indian word, which means literally "the doctrine of synthesis or equality." It will be India's task to work out this synthesis."*

Before taking a closer look at these remarkable words, four points need to be made.

First, Bose's fascist model was almost certainly Mussolini's Italy, not Hitler's Germany. In 1934 Bose made the first of several visits to Fascist Italy and found both the regime and its leader very agreeable. On that occasion he had a cordial (first) meeting with Mussolini—"a man who really counts in the politics of modern Europe." After *The Indian Struggle* appeared in print in 1935, Bose made a special stop in Rome personally to present a copy to the *Duce*.

Second, the book was completed a full year before the commencement of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia (Abyssinia), in October 1935. While Bose would, by the time he completed his book, have known about such violent incidents as "The Night of the Long Knives"—the SS killing of dozens of SA men on June 30, 1934—he had no real reason to consider the European fascist regimes unusually violent, murderous or bellicose. "I should like to point out that when I was writing the book," he later explained,

> *"Fascism had not started on its imperialistic expedition, and it appeared to me merely an aggressive form of nationalism. .. What I really meant was that we in India wanted our national freedom, and having won it, we wanted to move in the direction of Socialism. This is what I meant when I referred to a "synthesis between Communism and Fascism." Perhaps the expression I used was not a happy one."*

Third, despite Bose's claim to represent the political left, and that a party supporting a fusion of fascism and socialism would be ushered in by a "Left-Wing revolt," the ideology he expounded might more appropriately be regarded as right wing. Bose's ideology was radical and contained socialist elements—such as the desire to abolish the traditional class structure and create a society of equal opportunity, and the claim to represent the peasants and workers. To that extent it can be considered left wing. It is worth noting that Hitler's "right wing" political movement—the National Socialist German Workers' Party—shared many of Bose's "socialist" goals. Nehru, a committed socialist, challenged Bose's characterization of himself and his followers as left wing: "It seems to me that many of the so-called Leftists are more Right than the so-called Rightists. Strong language and a capacity to attack the old Congress leadership is not a test of Leftism in politics."

Lastly, it should be noted that Bose was willing to tone down his more radical political beliefs on those occasions when he considered it advantageous or necessary to do so. For example, in his February 1938 inaugural speech as President of the Indian National Congress, Bose—probably in a sincere attempt to placate the Gandhian faction—made statements that appear to represent almost an about face from the political views he had expounded

in *The Indian Struggle*. In a future independent India, he said, "the party itself will have a democratic basis, unlike, for instance, the Nazi party which is based on the "leader principle." The existence of more than one party and the democratic basis of the Congress party will prevent the future Indian State becoming a totalitarian one. Further, the democratic basis of the party will ensure that leaders are not thrust upon the people from above, but are elected from below." It is possible that these statements reflect a temporary change of mind, but it is more likely that they reflect Bose's efforts during this period to gain further political respectability, to prove that he was more than just a radical and revolutionary Bengali. By doing so he apparently hoped to win wider acceptance of the policies he wanted to implement in his year as Congress President: policies which were not especially radical or revolutionary.

According to Nirad Chaudhuri, his former personal secretary, Bose tried very hard during this period to seek agreement with the Gandhian faction over the direction the Congress party should move, and even "showed something like tender filial piety towards Gandhi," of whom he had been very critical in *The Indian Struggle*. It is against this political background that Bose's statements to the Congress party meeting in February 1938 should be seen.

A year later he successfully recontested the presidential election, but two months afterwards was forced to resign because of his inability to resolve his differences with Gandhi and the Gandhian faction. Probably believing that his earlier suspicions of democracy had been proven correct, and feeling that there was now no use in trying to win the favour or approval of more conservative elements in the Congress party, Bose once again proclaimed his belief in the efficacy of authoritarian government and a synthesis of fascism and socialism. Many similar examples can be cited to show how Bose outwardly (but probably not inwardly) modified his views to suit changing political contexts.

A Life for India

Throughout his political career, India's liberation from British rule remained Bose's foremost political goal; indeed, it was a lifelong obsession. As he explained in his most important work, *The Indian Struggle*, the political party he envisioned "will stand

for the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people." Speaking of Bose a few days after his death in August 1945, Jawaharlal Nehru said:

> *"In the struggle for the cause of India's independence he has given his life and has escaped all those troubles which brave soldiers like him have to face in the end. He was not only brave but had deep love for freedom. He believed, rightly or wrongly, that whatever he did was for the independence of India... Although I personally did not agree with him in many respects, and he left us and formed the Forward Bloc, nobody can doubt his sincerity. He struggled throughout his life for the independence of India, in his own way."*

Along with his abiding love for his country, Bose held an equally passionate hatred of the imperial power that ruled it: Great Britain. In a radio address broadcast from Berlin on March 1, 1943, he exclaimed that Britain's demise was near, and predicted that it would be " India's privilege to end that Satanic empire." The fundamental principle of his foreign policy, Bose declared in a May 1945 speech in Bangkok, is that " Britain's enemy is India's friend." Although these two speeches are from his final years, they express views he had held since before his April 1921 resignation from the Indian Civil Service. It was this principle of making friends with Britain's enemies in the hope that they would assist him in liberating India that brought him in 1941 to Germany and then, in 1943, to Japan.

Violence or Non-Violence?

Bose envisaged that "the complete political and economic liberation of the Indian people" would inevitably require the use of force. Just before resigning from the Indian Civil Service, he discussed with Dilip Kumar Roy, his closest friend, the subject of anti-British terrorism. "I admit is it regrettable," he said, "even ugly if you will, though it also has a terrible beauty of its own. But maybe that beauty does not unveil her face except for her devotees."

Violence was not new to Bose, even at that early stage of his career. In 1916 he had been expelled from Presidency College in Calcutta for his part in the violent assault on Professor Edward

Oaten, who had allegedly insulted Indian students. Moreover, although he occasionally claimed to "detest" violence, and criticized isolated acts of terrorism (which he considered ineffective and counterproductive), he was never really committed to Gandhi's policy of nonviolence. He regarded the Gandhi-supported civil disobedience campaign as an effective means of paralyzing the administration, but regarded it as inadequate unless accompanied by a movement aimed at total revolution and prepared, if necessary, to use violence.

Militarism

Related to Bose's willingness to use violence to gain political objective was his belief—expressed in *The Indian Struggle*, for example—that a government by a strong party should be "bound together by military discipline." Indeed Bose was infatuated with military discipline, and later commented that his basic training in the University Unit of the India Defence Force (for which he volunteered in 1917, while a student at Scottish Church College in Calcutta) "gave me something which I needed or which I lacked. The feeling of strength and of self-confidence grew still further." Bose was able to give much grander expression to his "militarism" when, in 1930, he volunteered to form a guard of honour during the ceremonial functions at the Calcutta session of the Congress party. Such guards of honour were not uncommon, but the one Bose formed and commanded was unlike anything previously seen. More than 2,000 volunteers were given military training and organized into battalions. About half wore uniforms, with specially designed steel-chain epaulettes for the officers. Bose, in full dress uniform (peaked cap, standing collar, ornamental breast cords, and jodhpurs) even carried a Field Marshal's baton when he reviewed his "troops." Photographs taken at the conference show him looking entirely out of place in a sea of *khadi* (traditional Indian clothing). Gandhi and several other champions of Nonviolence (*Ahimsa*) were uncomfortable with this display.

INA

A high point in Bose's "military career" came in July 1943 in Singapore. At a mass meeting there on July 4, Rash Behari Bose (no relation) handed over to him the leadership of the Indian

Independence League. The next day, Subhash Bose reviewed for the first time the soldiers of the Indian National Army (INA), which then comprised 13,000 men. In his address to the troops, which is a good example of his speaking style, he cited George Washington and Giuseppi Garibaldi as examples of men who led armies that won independence for their respective countries. Bose went on:

"Soldiers of India's army of liberation!...

"Every Indian must feel proud that this Army—his own Army—has been organized entirely under Indian leadership and that, when the historic moment arrives, under Indian leadership it will go to battle...

"Comrades! You have voluntarily accepted a mission that is the noblest that the human mind can conceive of. For the fulfilment of such a mission, no sacrifice is too great, not even the sacrifice of one's life...

"...Today is the proudest day of my life. For an enslaved people, there can be no greater pride, no higher honour, than to be the first soldier in the army of liberation. But this honour carries with it a corresponding responsibility, and I am deeply conscious of it. I assure you that I shall be with you in darkness and in sunshine, in sorrow and in joy, in suffering and in victory. For the present, I can offer you nothing except hunger, thirst, privation, forced marches and death. But if you follow me in life and in death, as I am confident you will, I shall lead you to victory and freedom. It does not matter who among us will live to see India free. It is enough that India shall be free, and that we shall give our all to make her free.

"May God now bless our Army and grant us victory in the coming fight!"

This "Free India Army" ("*Azad Hind Fauj*") would not only "emancipate India from the British yoke," he told the soldiers, but would, under his command, become the standing national army of the liberated nation.

Choreography for Impact

As his staging at the 1930 Calcutta session of the Congress party suggest, Bose understood early on the importance of political

choreography and the aesthetics of mass meetings. After his visits to Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany, he was even more mindful of the importance for any successful broad-based political movement of mass meetings, marches, visual symbols, and ceremonial or liturgical rituals. For example, at the 51st session of the Congress party at Haripura in 1938, Bose made sure that his entrance as the new Congress President would be spectacular. Escorted by 51 girls in saffron saris (the number corresponding with the number of the Congress session), he was seated in an ancient chariot drawn by 51 white bullocks, and taken on a two hour procession through 51 specially-constructed gates, accompanied by 51 brass bands.

Political choreography of this type—although not to this extreme degree—was very evident at all mass rallies (which sometimes attracted crowds numbering as many as 200,000) of the Forward Bloc party that Bose formed in 1939. Carefully chosen symbols, slogans and songs, coupled with a flood of written propaganda, were used in an unsuccessful attempt to make the Forward Bloc into a mass party.

Even during the last years of the war, when he was in southeast Asia heading the Provisional Government of Free India and the INA, he continued to choreograph carefully all of his rallies, meetings and ceremonies, in order to maximize their impact. He also realized that his own role in this choreography was central. Even in the hottest tropical weather, for instance, he wore an imposing military uniform, including forage cap, khaki tunic and jodhpurs, and shiny, knee-length black boots.

Moreover, whenever he travelled "he demanded all the rights and privileges of a head of state. On his road travels in Malaya, for example, he insisted on a full ceremonial escort; Japanese military jeeps mounted with sub-machine guns, a fleet of cars, and motorcycle outriders."

Historian Mihir Bose argues persuasively that such carefully planned actions were manifestations not of megalomania, but rather of Subhash Bose's effort to create a sense of unity transcending class, caste and origin among the large and diverse populations of Indians in Southeast Asia, to increase their political awareness, to arouse and inspire both them and his INA troops,

and to show the world that he regarded himself as a political leader of substance and importance.

This naturally raises the question of Bose's leadership style. In the passage from *The Indian Struggle* quoted above at length, he expressed his belief in what he called "the dictatorship of the party" (the party being the governing body of a free India), but he did not specify the precise nature of the party's leadership, or whether it, too, would be dictatorial. Most importantly, he did not state whether he saw himself as the party leader, or comment directly on what role he intended for himself in a free India. Nonetheless, clues about these details can be gleaned from other sections of *The Indian Struggle* and from the speeches and statements Bose made at various times throughout his career.

DETERMINED LEADERSHIP

Bose clearly admired strong, vigorous, military-type leaders, and in *The Indian Struggle* he listed several whom he particularly respected. These included Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and even a former British governor of Bengal, Sir Stanley Jackson. Nowhere in this book is there any criticism of these individuals (three of them dictators) for having too much power, yet another man is chastised for this: Mahatma Gandhi. Bose admired Gandhi for many things, not least his ability to "exploit the mass psychology of the people, just as Lenin did the same thing in Russia, Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany." But he accused Gandhi of accepting too much power and responsibility, of becoming a "Dictator for the whole country" who issued "decrees" to the Congress. According to Bose, Gandhi was a brilliant and gifted man, but, unlike Mussolini, Hitler and the others mentioned, a very ineffectual leader. Gandhi had failed to liberate India because of his frequent indecision and constant willingness to compromise with the Raj (something Bose said he would never do).

It is clear that Bose—who believed from his youth that he was destined for greatness —saw himself as a "strong" leader in the mold of those named above. "I ask those who have any doubts or suspicions in their minds to rely on me," he told the Indian Independence League Conference in Singapore on July 4, 1943. He continued:

> *"I shall always be loyal to India alone. I will never deceive my motherland. I will live and die for India. .. The British could not bring me to submission by inflicting hardships on me. British statesmen could neither induce me nor deceive me. There is no one who can divert me from the right path."*

Bose was decisive, aggressive and ambitious, and even as a university student, these features of his personality attracted many devoted followers. Dilip Kumar Roy, his companion during his days as a student at Cambridge, referred to him as "strength-inspiring," and the absolute leader of the Indian student population.

Bose's militarism, ambition and leadership traits do not necessarily indicate (contrary to popular opinion) that he was a leader in the fascist mold. If they did, one would have to consider all personalities with similar traits—Winston Churchill, for example—as "fascist." In this regard, it is worth noting that during his many years as head of various councils, committees and offices, and during 15-month tenure as President of the Indian National Congress (February 1938 to May 1939), Bose never acted in an undemocratic manner, nor did he claim powers or responsibilities to which he was not constitutionally or customarily entitled. Neither did he attempt in any way to foster a cult of his own personality (as, it could be argued, Gandhi did).

However, after he assumed control of the INA in July-August 1943, Bose's leadership style underwent a transformation. First, he allowed a cult of his personality to flourish among the two million or so Indians living in southeast Asia. Prayers were regularly said on his behalf, and his birthday celebrations were—like Gandhi's in India—major festivals. He was invincible, according to one Indian myth from this period, and could not be harmed by bombs or bullets. An image of Bose that stressed his strength of character, military prowess, and willingness to sacrifice for a free India was intentionally promoted in propaganda broadcasts and printed material. With his approval, the title *Netaji* ("Revered Leader") was added to his name in all articles about him appearing in the newspapers of the Indian Independence League; even his staff officers were permitted to address him with this title. By the end of the war, few Indians in south Asia still referred to him by name; he was always respectfully called *Netaji*.

AUTHORITARIAN RULE

Second, in contrast to his statement at the 1938 Haripura session of the Congress party (quoted above)—that leaders would be elected from below—Bose proclaimed, on October 21, 1943, the formation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind ("Free India"). While retaining his post as Supreme Commander of the Indian National Army, he announced that he was naming himself Head of State, Prime Minister, and Minister for War and Foreign Affairs. (The most important of these positions—Head of State—he anticipated retaining in a free India.) These appointments involved no democratic process or voting of any kind. Further, the authority he exercised in these posts was dictatorial and often very harsh. He demanded total obedience and loyalty from the Indians in south Asia, and any who opposed him, his army or government faced imprisonment, torture, or even execution.

Additionally, if wealthy Indians did not contribute sufficient funds to Bose's efforts, they risked confiscation of their property. Bose's threats were taken very seriously, and had the desired effect: funds did pour in. His INA troops were obliged to swear an oath of loyalty to both the Provisional Government and to him personally. He ordered the summary execution of all INA deserters, and also prepared (but was never able to implement) law codes for the entire population of India. These laws, which stipulated the death penalty for a range of offences, were to come into force when the INA, together with the Japanese Army, entered India to fight against the British. With regard to his leadership style during this 1943-1945 period, in fairness to Bose is should be pointed out that the entire world was then engulfed in a horrendous war, and political and military leaders everywhere, on all sides, adapted extraordinarily authoritarian and repressive measures. Some of the measures and policies adapted by the wartime government of the United States, for instance, were as oppressive and as severe as any planned or implemented by Bose.

A NEW INDIA

Bose clearly anticipated that the British would be driven out of India in an armed struggle (under his leadership), and that a social and political revolution would begin the moment the Indian people saw British rule under attack in India itself. This

revolution, he believed, would bring an end to the old caste system and traditional social hierarchy, which would be replaced by an egalitarian, casteless and classless society based on socialist models. This process would require very careful guidance, with a firm hand, to prevent anarchy and chaos. Bose had, in fact, held these beliefs since the early 1930s, as Mrs. Kitty Kurti, a close German friend of Bose, revealed in her anecdotal memoir. At a June 1933 meeting attended by Kurti, Bose explained that:

> *"Besides a plan of action which will lead up to the conquest of power, we shall require a programme for the new state when it comes into existence in India. Nothing can be left to chance. The group of men and women who will assume the leadership of the fight with Great Britain will also have to take up the task of controlling, guiding and developing the new state and, through the state, the entire Indian people. If our leaders are not trained for postwar leadership also there is every possibility that after the conquest of power a period of chaos will set in and incidents similar to those for the French Revolution of the 18th century may be repeated in India. ... The generals of the wartime period in India will have to carry through the whole programme of postwar reforms in order to justify to their countrymen the hopes and aspirations that they will have to rouse during the fight. The task of these leaders will not be over till a new generation of men and women are educated and trained after the establishment of the new state and this new generation are able to take complete charge of their country's affairs."*

This explains what Bose meant in *The Indian Struggle* when he wrote (as quoted above) of the need for a strong, single-party government, "bound together by military discipline" with "dictatorial powers for some years to come, in order to put India on her feet." Only an very strong government, strict discipline, and dictatorial rule would, according to Bose, prevent the anticipated revolution from falling into chaos and anarchy. That is why the government would not—"in the first years after liberation"—"stand for a democracy in the Mid-Victorian sense of the term." It would use whatever military force was necessary to maintain law and order, and would not relinquish authority or re-establish more regular forms of government until it felt confident that "the work of postwar social reconstruction" had

been completed and "a new generation of men and women in India, fully trained and equipped for the battle of life" had emerged.

Bose clearly anticipated that authoritarian rule would not last beyond the period when social reconstruction was completed, and law and order were established—when India was "on its feet," as he often wrote. As he frequently stated, Bose aimed for nothing less than the formation of "a new India and a happy India on the basis of the eternal principles of liberty, democracy and socialism." He rejected Communism (at least as it was practiced in the Soviet Union) principally because of its internationalism, and because he believed that the theoretical ideal found in the writings of Marx could not be applied, without modification, to India. Still, he maintained socialist views throughout his adult life, and, on very many occasions, expressed his hope for an egalitarian (especially classless and casteless) industrialized society in which the state would control the basic means of production.

He was opposed to liberalism, believing that greater emphasis should be placed on social goals than on the needs or desires of individuals. Individual wishes, he reasoned, must be subordinated to the needs of the state, especially during the struggle for independence and the period of reconstruction immediately following liberation. Nonetheless, having himself been imprisoned eleven times and sent into exile three times, he was fully committed to upholding the rights of minority intellectual, religious, cultural and racial groups. He hoped for an "all-round freedom for the Indian people—that is, for social, economic and political freedom," and would, he said "wage a relentless war against bondage of every kind till the people can become really free."

It could be argued that he was not as committed to the principle of democracy as he was to socialism and freedom (as he defined it). While he extolled democracy on numerous occasions, at other times his words suggest a belief that other parties would have a place, in a free India, only as long as they were "working towards the same end, in whole or in part," as his governing party. Political pluralism did not appeal to him at all. He seems to have envisioned a free India that was more authoritarian than democratic. His own actions as head of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind illustrate a lack of regard for the democratic process.

Mass Mobilization

Bose was, nonetheless, a consistent advocate of total mobilization: the mustering of national resources on a scale normally associated with military-like action. Realizing that manpower was easily India's greatest resource (and arguably the only one available to the independence movement), he proclaimed that all Indians—male and female, urban and rural, rich and poor—should actively participate in the fight for freedom. From his earliest days in politics to his death in 1945, he sought to rouse the great Indian masses, and involve them directly in the political struggle. Their support for representatives at the provincial or national levels was not enough; they must themselves rise up and win independence.

During the 1930s, however, his political position was never strong enough to call for other resources than manpower, nor was India—under British control—able to offer other resources. Additionally, total mobilization during peacetime, without an impending war or revolution in the awareness of the masses, had never been achieved (not even by the Nazis) and, arguably, never could be achieved. Bose, an astute man, no doubt realized this. With the formation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind, he was at last in a position to appeal directly for total mobilization to the mass of Indians—at least in Southeast Asia, and, less directly to those in India itself. Along with his call for mass mobilization, he demanded that all available resources be provided for the cause of freedom. For example, he told a mass meeting in Singapore in July 9, 1943: "Friends! You will now realize that the time has come for the three million Indians living in East Asia to mobilize all their available resources, including money and manpower. Half-hearted measures will not do. I want Total Mobilization and nothing less, for we have been told repeatedly, even by our enemies, that this is a total war... Out of this total mobilization I expect at least three hundred thousand soldiers and three crores of dollars [$30,000,000]. I want also a unit of brave women to form a death-defying regiment who will wield the sword which the brave Rani of Jhansi wielded..."

Of course, Bose demanded not only the total mobilization of Indian resources in south Asia, but of Indian resources everywhere.

He called for mass mobilization not only in support of his army, but also for his dynamic new government, the various branches of which required financing and manpower.

Women's Equality

As can be seen from the passage quoted above, Bose called on both men *and* women for total support. Unlike the German National Socialists and the Italian Fascists, who stressed the masculine in almost all spheres of social and political activity, Bose believed that women were the equals of men, and should therefore be likewise prepared to fight and sacrifice for India's liberation. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s he had campaigned in India to bring women more fully into the life of the nation. After his return to Asia in 1943, he called on women to serve as soldiers in the Indian National Army—at the time a most radical view. "When I express my confidence that you are today prepared to fight and suffer for the sake of your motherland," he told the women's section of the Independence League in July 1943,

"I do not mean only to cajole you with empty words. I know the capabilities of our womanhood well. I can, therefore, say with certainty that there is no task which our women cannot undertake and no sacrifice and suffering which our women cannot undergo... To those who say that it will not be proper for our women to carry guns, my only request is that they look into the pages of our history. What brave deeds the Rani of Jhansi performed during the First War of Independence in 1857... Indians—both common people and members of the British Indian army—who are on the border areas of India, will, on seeing you march with guns on your shoulders, voluntarily come forward to receive the guns from you and carry on the struggle started by you."

A women's regiment was formed in 1943, and came to number about 1,000 women. It was named, appropriately, the "Rani of Jhansi Regiment," after a heroine of the Indian rebellion of 1857-58 against British rule. While those less suited to combat duties were employed as nurses and in other support roles, the majority were trained as soldiers. When the INA attacked British forces from Burma in east India in mid-1944, the women of the Jhansi Regiment fought alongside the men, suffering equally heavy casualties. When the army was forced to withdraw, the women were given no privileges. Along with the men, they marched for more than a thousand kilometres.

Commitment to Youth

Lastly, Bose was also deeply committed to the youth movement, a devotion that featured prominently in his political ideology. Convinced that young people were by nature idealistic, restless and open to new ideas —such his own radical and militant outlook—Bose accordingly devoted a great deal of time and effort to the new Youth Leagues that were formed in a number of provinces during the 1920s. Throughout his career he presided over far more youth conferences than any other all-India political figure, and his speeches to younger people he steadfastly urged a spirit of activism that contrasted sharply with the passivism preached by Gandhi and many of the older politicians. "One of the most hopeful signs of the time," he claimed at the 1928 Maharashtra Provincial Conference, "is the awakening among the youth of this country... Friends! I would implore you to assist in the awakening of youth and in the organization of the youth movement. Self-conscious youth will not only act, but will also dream; will not only destroy, but will also build. It will succeed where even you may fail; it will create for you a new India—and a free India—out of the failures, trials and experiences of the past." India's liberation would be achieved not by Gandhi and the leading politicians of his generation, whose conservative, reformist policies bred passivity and inactivity. It would, Bose believed, be achieved only through the efforts and sacrifices of the militant, revolutionary and politically-conscious younger generation.

Economic Views

In contrast to the copious record of Bose's political ideology and actions, much less is available about other important elements of his outlook, such as his economic views and policies. For example, while he condemned capitalism and extolled socialism in the pages of *The Indian Struggle*, Bose was very vague about just what monetary or credit systems he foresaw in a free India. They would be set up, he simply wrote, "in the light of the theories and the experiments that have been and are current in the modern world." Throughout his career he never wrote or said anything

more specific about such matters. He appears to have had no precise ideas about political economy, save that economics was not important in itself but must be subordinated to national political considerations. Any discussion here of what economic systems he favoured, and when and how he intended to implement them, would thus be merely speculative.

Unique Political Ideology

While Bose's political ideology can reasonably be described as essentially "fascistic," two qualifying points need to be made here. First, his ideology and actions were not the result of any extreme neurotic or pathological psychosocial impulses. He was not a megalomaniac, nor did he display any of the pathological traits often attributed (rightly or wrongly) to fascist leaders, such as hostile aggression, obsessive hatred or delusions. Moreover, while he was an ardent patriot and nationalist, Bose's nationalism was cultural, not racialist. Second, his radical political ideology was shaped by a consuming frustration with the unsuccessful efforts of others to gain independence for India. His "fascist" outlook did not come from a drive for personal power or social elevation. While he was ambitious, and clearly enjoyed the devotion of his followers, his obsession was not adulation or power, but rather freedom for his beloved Motherland—a goal for which he was willing to suffer and sacrifice, even at the cost of his life.

Bose was favourably impressed with the discipline and organizational strength of fascism as early as 1930, when he first expressed support for a synthesis of fascism and socialism. During his stays in Europe during the 1930s, he was deeply moved by the dynamism of the two major "fascist" powers, Italy and Germany. After observing these regimes first-hand, he developed a political ideology of his own that, he was convinced, could bring about the liberation of India and the total reconstruction of Indian society along vaguely authoritarian-socialist lines. Bose's lack of success in his lifelong effort to liberate India from alien rule was certainly not due to any lack of effort. From 1921, when he became the first Indian to resign formally from the Indian Civil Service, until his death in 1945 as leader of an Indian government in exile, Subhash Chandra Bose struggled ceaselessly to achieve freedom and prosperity for his beloved homeland.

Tripuri Congress Redux

The purpose of this essay is not to belittle Mahatma Gandhi. The reader will notice that nowhere has Gandhi's campaign to oust Bose been termed as immoral or unethical. At the same time it is not possible to know the truth by imposing divinity on Gandhi. The Tripuri Congress session of 1939 is a crucial event in the history of the Indian National Congress. The united resistance and non-cooperation of the conservative leadership cleared the way for the removal of the recently re-elected Congress president Subhash Chandra Bose. Bose was compelled to resign very soon. It won't be an exaggeration to say that the Tripuri session was the theatre of the demise of Bose's political career. Mahatma Gandhi was not present in the Tripuri session, but later when Bose repeatedly sought his intervention to end the stalemate, his stubborn refusal only hastened Bose's resignation. Even today Tripuri remains in the collective memory of Bengalis as a gross injustice done by Gandhi to Bose and Bengal. The consequent loss of Gandhi's image continues till today. On re-evaluating the incident after almost 65 years, certain questions arise which have never been answered squarely. This essay raises those little-discussed issues.

Was Gandhi Afraid of Bose?

Gandhi himself proposed Bose's name as the President of Congress in the Haripura Session of 1938. But within a year he literally became desperate to remove Bose and did not hesitate to take recourse to any sort of tactics to serve the purpose. His only objective at that time was Bose's removal by any means. No opinion regarding whether Gandhi's move was ethical or not can be objective, but at the same time it is pertinent to ask if he was afraid of Bose. Blind followers of Gandhi will of course laugh away such a question. They will argue that at that the national level Gandhi's status and influence was supreme, whereas the sphere of Bose's influence was limited. In that case, the question that begs answer is why was Gandhi so worried? It was clear as daylight to the whole country that he did not want Bose to continue. Despite such explicit opposition from Gandhi how did Bose get re-elected? Certainly not by rigging the election! Perhaps Gandhi was not perturbed even by the British government to the extent as he was by Bose. If he was confident of himself, what was the

reason for Gandhi not to confront Bose directly rather than reverting to political trickery? It is important to be clear about one thing regarding this issue. Many intellectuals, despite having high regards for Bose, cannot consider the Bose-Gandhi feud objectively. It almost amounts to sin for them even to think that Gandhi can do something unethical. They meticulously desist from associating Gandhi with any sort of Machiavellian politics since they consider him as much above petty politics. Furthermore, they present the accounts of many contemporary revolutionaries who could not see any wrong in Gandhi's actions in spite of being Bose's followers. It is now time to show clearly how both schools of arguments do not hold ground.

Firstly, overwhelming evidence has come to light showing Gandhi directly involved in the conspiracy to remove Bose. Gandhi's statements, letters etc. of those days are now available with the publication of his complete works. However, it was not possible for the revolutionaries during the Tripuri session to understand Gandhi's intentions, which he did not share even with his closest associates. Thus, it was virtually impossible for those revolutionaries, who despite being followers of Bose respected Gandhi, to assess Gandhi's true character. Therefore, even as they were pained by the anti-Bose actions of Gandhi, they failed to realize the Machiavellian tactics adopted by him.

Secondly, the question of right or wrong is in once sense irrelevant here since Machiavellian strategies are to some extent required in realpolitik. If Gandhi was determined to get rid of Bose for the sake of his own power and influence then his actions can be regarded as the most unethical. On the other hand, if he was moved by the consideration that removing Bose was necessary for the good of the country then his actions cannot be labelled unethical, since the interest of the country is always larger than the individual. It is not easy to resolve this debate. It can however be resolved easily if Gandhi is seen as a clever politician instead of placing him in the high pedestal as a divine personality, without going into the question of right or wrong. It is abundantly evident that Gandhi was bothered by the rise of Bose and that he took recourse to a confrontation by proxy rather than facing him in a direct way. It was almost a nonviolent guerilla war. From Gandhi's point of view he was right. It is foolish to expect that he would

give up to his biggest political challenger. Rather it is expected that he would resist fiercely with his entire prowess.

Even if Gandhians are upset, it will have to be admitted that only when one is pushed to the wall one becomes as desperate to fight back as Gandhi was. From that perspective Bose emerged victorious at Tripuri. Gandhi's statement that Sitaramayya's defeat was an indirect defeat for him was true in essence. To wash off the bitter taste of defeat, Gandhi threw away his principle of means being more important than the goal. It was possible to see such an astonishing U-turn of Gandhism only due to Bose's victory.

Tripuri and the subsequent flow of events prove beyond any doubt that Gandhi jettisoned his cherished ideals and instead adopted a totally un-Gandhian approach. It can be said that changing strategies or positions in politics is not unethical. Therefore it will suffice to say, without raising the issue of ethics, that Gandhi became desperate and broke out of his own value system since he acutely felt an existential crisis. From that perspective, Tripuri saw the defeat of the conventional Gandhiism and the emergence of a new Machiavellian Gandhiism. The events of Tripuri provide the burning proof that Gandhiism is not based on eternal ideals and values.

Gandhi as an Avatar of Machiavelli

The name of the famous Italian intellectual Nicolo Machiavelli has been associated with all sorts of unethical means for achieving political goals. Machiavelli laid more importance on the goal than on the means and advocated the dissociation of religion from politics. In the second sense Gandhi was not Machiavellian since he advocated just the opposite, which is, associating religion with politics. In the first sense he did follow the Machiavellian way to remove Bose out of his way. Bose was ready to follow any path for the attainment of independence for India, but never adopted Machiavellian ways in case of internal politics of Congress. This is where he is different from Gandhi. Although Bose understood perfectly the nature of the British Raj, he dangerously failed to understand Gandhi. It has been rightly said by Amalesh Tripathi that Bose did not realize that his real conflict was with Gandhi himself. In his letter to Jawaharlal Nehru on 28 August 1939 he complained, "If the old guard wanted to fight why did they not

do so in a straightforward manner? Why did they bring Mahatma Gandhi between us?" On 4 April 1939 Sarat Chandra Bose, Bose's elder brother had written to Nehru along the same lines, "I believe I shall not be unjust if I say that the members of the Working Committee would have shown greater courage and straightforwardness if they had decided to act on their own and not used Mahatmaji as their cover. Their plain duty was to keep Mahatmaji above all controversy as he should be in our political life." Both put on the dock Gandhi's followers like Sardar Patel, Bhulabhai Desai etc.

Sarat Bose expressed his displeasure in a sharp letter written to Gandhi on 21 March 1939. He wrote, "Tripuri was an eye opener to me. The exhibition of truth and nonviolence of your chosen disciples stunk in my nostrils. The election of Subhash was not a defeat for yourself, but of the high command of which Sardar Patel is the shining light." In fact the conservative leadership comprising of Patel, Desai and others kicked up a vilification campaign against Bose at Tripuri after calling his illness a 'political fever.' Bose wrote about this painful experience in his essay "My strange Illness." Patel was the focus of his wrath in his letter of 28 March too. Bose wrote to Nehru, "Was there nothing wrong in Sardar Patel making full use of the name and authority of Mahatma Gandhi for electioneering purposes?" He failed to understand that his true opponent was Gandhi who was actually controlling the unfolding of events from behind the curtain. In that sense Patel and others did not take recourse to any trickery and confronted Bose openly. The allegations that Bose brought agains them should have been raised against Gandhi. Why was he fighting a proxy war instead of playing a frontal role?

Gandhi wrote to his secretary Mahadev Desai on 29 January 1939 that he might not attend the Tripuri session if Bose wins the election. On 3 February 1939 he wrote to Nehru that he will serve the country although he will not attend the Congress session. He left for Rajkot on 27 February and the infamous Pant resolution was proposed on 8 March 1939: a classic example of pure Machiavellian politics. Gandhi knew well that the Pant resolution will be proposed in his absence, but then he will be able to deny any responsibility for the proposal. At a time when Bose was repeatedly asking for Gandhi's opinion and seeking his

intervention, all he could say was that he did not want to impose his choice on Bose. He wrote on 10 April 1939 that the more he read the Pant proposal the worse he feels, but he can't explain. Today many intellectuals who have high regard for both Gandhi and Bose can't see any dishonesty in Gandhi's action.

They however cannot be blamed since Bose himself failed to see any dishonesty in Gandhi. He even rebuked Narendra Narayan Chakrabarty when he suggested so. The question that now arises is whether Gandhi would have felt it necessary to carry on with his programme of fast at Rajkot if Bose was defeated. Secondly, if Gandhi was unhappy with the Pant proposal why did he not ask for an amendment? Thirdly, while advising Bose to constitute his cabinet of similar thinking leaders, was Gandhi not aware of its impossibility at that point of time? It would be over simplification to say that Gandhi was revengeful, but the fact remains that such a crafty politician has rarely been seen in this country.

That was one area where Bose could not equal Gandhi as he was a staunch opponent of the trend of politicking in Congress. The British Raj however knew Gandhi as a clever Machiavellian politician. Although Bose opposed Gandhi's politics, he had high regards for him. Perhaps that is why he could not comprehend the true nature of Gandhi's politics. Now the question is, did Gandhi play this game of war by proxy to maintain his image? If that was the case, it was a terrible miscalculation because the Tripuri events pained even many of his followers. In general his image suffered a blow. His true intentions were clear as daylight.

When he described Bose's victory as his own defeat, there was no deception. Rather such straight talk is laudable. Had be provided the leadership to the conservative politicians in opposing Bose then surely his image would have gained a new high and he would have been praised. But instead he chose a path which was murky. He gained a victory which was but temporary. It was impossible for Gandhi to suppress Bose. The evidence of that has been written in golden letters in future history.

Did Bose have a Weakness for Gandhi?

Bose started making efforts to bring an end to his conflict with Gandhi after the Tripuri session. Manabendra Nath Roy rightly advised him in a letter written on 1 February 1939 to accept

Gandhi's challenge and constitute a cabinet of his liking. However Bose did not accept the advice. This was one reason of losing the support of the leftists. Revolutionary of the Juagantar group told the writer that Bose's seeking of Gandhi's support, who had meted him such undignified treatment, also led to anger in certain sections of the revolutionary groups. Late Manohar Mukhopadhyay, another revolutionary of the Jugantar group, also told the writer that Bose was hesitant act against Gandhi.

Perhaps there is some truth in such opinion, but if Bose showed any soft attitude in certain situations towards Gandhi it was due to strategic reasons, not due to any weakness. The former Prime Morarji Desai has made a laughable statement in his autobiography that Gandhi accepted Bose as the President in the Haripura Congress only after Bose promised that he will go by Gandhi's directions. Those familiar with Bose's character know well that he was not one to submit to Gandhi in such a way, but might have just restrained his extreme revolutionary identity for the time being. Rajendra Prasad has written in his autobiography that if Bose had expressed his willingness to be re-elected to Gandhi perhaps the Tripuri conflict could have been avoided. How strange! Would Bose beg Gandhi for his democratic rights? He did not compromise on this issue because with all his respect for Gandhi he was not prepared to take his words as the final. And if he had withdrawn himself from the contest in accordance with Gandhi's wishes, he could not have held his head high in future. This would have not only set a bad precedent, but would have stifled democracy in Congress. Of course democracy was ultimately stifled in Congress due to Gandhi and his followers, but Bose was not involved with that. He did not sign the death warrant of democracy in Congress. It can of course be asked that why did Bose allow Pant resolution to be raised knowing that it was unconstitutional and undemocratic? He explained to Gandhi in a letter written on 25 March 1939 that he could have vetoed this proposal but did not do so because his democratic outlook had the priority over the issue of constitutional validity. He also wrote, "I felt it would be unmanly to take shelter behind the constitution at a time when I felt that there was the possibility of an adverse vote."

This is where Bose committed a blunder since it made easy for Gandhi to write on 30 March 1939, "Since you think that Pant's resolution was out of order and the clause relating to the Working Committee is clearly unconstitutional, and were ultra vires your course is absolutely clear. Your choice of the committee should be unfettered." Even if this might appear to be transparent, so certain questions are bound to arise. Firstly, why didn't Gandhi clearly comment on the Pant resolution? Gandhi asked Bose to form the cabinet of his choice only because Bose thought that the proposal was unconstitutional.

In other words, Gandhi himself did not think that the proposal was unconstitutional. He told Bose on 10 April 1939, "The framers meant well. But it does not answer the present difficulty. You should therefore give it your own interpretation." By talking about the good intention of the proposal Gandhi supported it indirectly, but never spelt it out clearly. It would have been manly if he had stated his opinion clearly, but instead he created a situation where there was no other way for Bose than to resign. It is true that Bose sought Gandhi's intervention repeatedly at that time, but that was not from his weakness for him. He hoped against hope that Gandhi will resolve the internal conflict of Congress in the larger interest of the country. He wrote to Gandhi on 31 March 1939, "We are not vindictive and we do not nurse grievances. There is no doubt that today there is a wide gulf between the two main blocs or parties in the Congress. But the gulf can be bridged – that by you." In another letter he wrote, "I am temperamentally not a vindictive person and I do not nurse grievances. I have the mentality of a boxer that is to shake hands smilingly when the boxing bout is over and take the revolt in a sporting spirit."

Bose could never imagine that his sportsman spirit will have no impact on Gandhi's mind. Gandhi was so disturbed by him that he had already thought up his course of action. Usually action agenda in politics is determined according to time and expediency, but in this case it was determined much earlier in what can be called fait accompli. Gandhi can be asked if he had started considering himself as weak. His innovativeness shows through the methods he adopted to remove Bose from his position. It is unfortunate that instead of applying such political methods against the British Raj, he used it against a great son of India. Bose was a staunch anti-imperialist, but due to irony of fate he became a victim to both imperialist oppression and subversive internal

politics of Congress. He wanted a compromise with Gandhi in the interest of the larger interest of the country. The British Raj always wanted to split India by its divide and rule policy. Bose wanted to rise above personal grievances realizing that the internal conflict will only strengthen the British policy of divide and rule. But Gandhi was immovable from his position and thus all efforts of Bose failed. It must be remembered that despite all this Bose kept the path of cooperation with Gandhi open. He also joined the special session of Congress on Gandhi's invitation at Wardha after being expelled from Congress. Bose-baiters might see an effort of appeasement in this but if Bose truly had any weakness for Gandhi he wouldn't have searched for an alternative to the Gandhian way. Probably he had hoped that he would be able to convince Gandhi to accept the relevance and importance of his plan of action. When he realized that he was only chasing a mirage, he decided to leave the country. Whether the country gained or suffered a loss will be judged by history but the fact remains that Bose was the only leader who showed the courage of proposing an alternative to the Gandhian way. The main source of his conflict with Gandhi can be found in his unique nature.

Paradoxical Ethics

Many people have charged Gandhi for adopting unethical means to get rid of Bose. According to this writer, the whole issue needs to be judged from a different point of view. As Krishna advised the Pandavas to take recourse to action which apparently was Adharma to be able to ensure victory of truth, Gandhi wanted to achieve a larger ethical framework by going through apparently unethical means. This can be called paradox of morality. Concepts of right and wrong etc. are never absolute. These are relative and can vary according to the time, place, persons involved etc. Gandhi's stubborn attitude towards Bose actually proves the flexibility of his mental makeup because it clearly shows that he did not cling on to any particular idea about morality. Many people have opined that the rigid attitude shown initially by Gandhi towards the issue of violence and nonviolence was much relaxed during his later years. According to this author, it was on the issue of morality that Gandhi showed the most flexibility. He surpassed even Machiavelli in political maneuvering. Yet many intellectuals are still skeptical about this. Actually they have

accepted absolutely accepted whatever Gandhi said, that is, they think that whatever he propounded is equally applicable in all cases. However, Gandhi himself changed his position on many occasions without being bound by the fetters of so-called traditional morality. Those who want to show Gandhi as an idealist by ignoring his practical nature, forget that he himself had said, "I am a practical idealist." The practical side of his character was exposed during his campaign to oust Bose. There is a need to remove the illusion of the learned scholars on this issue.

Let there be No Illusion

A few years back a learned argument through letters between two historians was published in the pages of Jayasree. Shri Sandip Das and Shri Girish Chandra Maiti expressed their opposing views about the role of Gandhi in the Tripuri Congress. Girish Chandra provided the evidence that Gandhi was aware of the Pant proposal well beforehand and it is clear from his statement given on 5 May 1939 at the Gandhi Seva Sangh in Vrindavan that he was told about this proposal while he was fasting at Rajkot. Gandhi said that he himself would have gone beyond, that is, he would have introduced a no-confidence motion against Bose. He dared his followers in Wardha to introduce a no-confidence motion. Sandip Das, ignoring this vital piece of evidence, said that he learnt from many revolutionaries that Gandhi was not dishonest in his behaviour. It has already been said in this essay that it was not possible for the revolutionaries to know the real intention of Gandhi at that time. Secondly, the above evidence emanates directly from Gandhi. Therefore it is pointless (unless the evidence is disproved) to say that Gandhi was not aware of the Pant proposal. If there is any doubt regarding the veracity of Gandhi's statement, that should be stated clearly. Historians have to depend on two kinds of sources – primary and secondary. Although oral history has gained currency at present, still rigorous research should place more importance on primary evidence rather than hearsay. Gandhi's statement is without doubt a primary evidence. It would be contrary to convention of historical research to reject that based on hearsay. If any documentary evidence to the contrary cannot be presented then the reliability of the above mentioned source is definitely established beyond doubt.

A critic definitely has the right to interpret and analyse events, but it is desirable to be rational rather than be driven by emotions. Thirdly, Shri Das has cited the following quote from Gandhi, "No doubt I like politics too. But it is a different kind. There is no place for scheming in it." There is no doubt about the veracity of the quote, it should be interpreted with an open mind. To say that there was no place of scheming in Gandhi's political activities or in his thoughts is to belittle him. Although the appeared as a saint actually he was a shrewd politician. Otherwise he couldn't have bothered the British Raj to that extent. The saintly prophetic image covered his true identity of a political leader of unlimited intelligence. Nothing is unmixed right or wrong in politics, but depends on the situation. What Gandhi meant by the above quote is that he cannot accept scheming for fulfilling petty ambitions of individuals. That does not mean he was indifferent to use of political maneuvering for achieving political goals. The tendency to paint Gandhi as a superhuman or a saint has stemmed from the traditional concepts of morality. Any assessment of Gandhi will be one-sided, nebulous and irrational if this illusion of traditionalism is not transcended.

The purpose of this essay is not to belittle Gandhi. The reader will notice that nowhere has Gandhi's campaign to oust Bose been termed as immoral or unethical. At the same time it is not possible to know the truth by imposing divinity on Gandhi. It is not possible to stay above conflicts after entering the world of politics. It is also a fact that once inside the political whirlpool, even great men show self-contradicting attributes. It is not desirable to ignore such attributes due to blind devotion. The centre space of politics is focused towards human beings and not divinities. Therefore any search for political values should be focused on human nature and not divine ones. The spiritual politics that Gandhi refers to is primarily morality-based politics but such morality is dynamic and ever changing. It is not bound by any ideological limits. It is the humble submission of this writer that many problems will be solved more easily if neither Gandhi nor Bose is treated as superhuman or divine beings, but as humans of flesh and blood.

4

Bose's Vision for India

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF INDIA

Netaji addresses students of the Tokyo University in November 1944. I do not propose to speak to such a distinguished gathering on the commonplace things that you hear and read about India. I think it would be far better if I speak to you on the more fundamental problems of India. Having being a student of philosophy myself, I am naturally more interested in fundamental problems. I hope you will also agree with me that I should rather speak to you today on some of the fundamental problems that face my country, both in the present as well as in the future.

In my travels abroad, I have often found that people generally have a wrong and sometimes a rather funny idea about my country. For instance, among the people in Europe, the general idea about India is that it is a land in which three things can be found: Snakes, fakirs and maharajas. Among those who have been influenced by British propaganda, the general idea about India is that it is a country where people are always fighting among themselves, and where the strong hand of Britain is required in order to maintain peace and order among the people.

If you approach the Orientalists in Europe, that is, the experts in Indology, you will find that they look upon India as a land of mystics and philosophers, a land which at one time produced a very rich philosophy, but which is today as dead as the ancient civilizations of Egypt and Babylon.

Now the question is, "what is India in reality?" No doubt we have a very ancient civilization, but unlike other ancient

civilizations, such as Egypt or Babylon, Phoenicia or even Greece, the ancient culture and civilization of India is not dead. It still lives in the present. And we Indians of today think the same thoughts fundamentally, the same thoughts and have the same feelings, the same ideals of life, as our forefathers who lived 2,000 or 3,000 years ago. In other words, there is a continuity, historical and cultural continuity, extending from ancient times till the present day-which is in some ways a very remarkable thing in history. Now, in order to understand India, this fundamental fact should first be understood, namely, that the India of the past is not dead. India of the past lives in the present, and will live in the future.

Against this background, this ancient background, we see changes in our national life from age to age. During the last 3,000 years, people have come into India from outside with new ideas, some times with new cultures. All these new influences, ideas and cultures have been gradually absorbed into the national life of India, so that in spite of the fact that, fundamentally we have the same culture and civilization as we had several thousand years ago, we have nevertheless changed and moved with the times. Today, in spite of our ancient background, we are able to live in a modern world and adapt ourselves to that world.

Those who have been influenced, whether consciously or unconsciously by British propaganda, have the impression that India was very easily conquered by the British and also that after the British conquest of India our country was for the first time politically unified. Both these notions are entirely wrong and without foundation. In the first place, it is not true that India was easily conquered by the British. It took British 100 years, from 1757 to 1857, to finally subjugate India. Secondly, it is also an entirely wrong notion to think that India was politically unified by the British. The fact is that India was for the first time politically unified nearly 2,500 years ago under the Buddhist Emperor, Ashoka the Great. In reality, India of the time of Ashoka the Great was even larger than the India of today. Ashoka's India included not only modern India, but also Afghanistan and a part of Persia.

After the time of Ashoka, India has gone through many ups and downs in her national life. There have been periods decay, followed by periods of progress and national upheaval. But through these ups and downs in our national life, we have been able, in the long run, to keep our progress. About 1000 years after Ashoka, India again reached the zenith of progress under the Gupta Emperors. This was followed by another glorious epoch in Indian history about nine hundred years later under the Mogul Emperors. Therefore, it is worth remembering that the British notion that we have been unified politically under British rule is entirely wrong. All that the British have tried to do is to divide the Indian people and to weaken, disarm and emasculate them.

I shall now present before you a problem which will interest scientists, and in particular students of sociology. The question is whether the Indian people have any right to live as a free nation. In other words, have they the strength and the vitality left in them to live and to develop themselves as a free nation? I personally hold the opinion that if a nation once loses its vitality, its inner vitality, then it has no right to exist. And even if it does continue to exist after loosing its vitality, that existence will have hardly any worth or value for mankind. The only reason why I stand for India's freedom and believe as a free nation we shall have a glorious future is that I believe that we have sufficient vitality left in us to live as free men and develop as a nation.

Now, if I have to answer this question as to whether sufficient vitality is left in us, I shall have to answer two questions: firstly, has our nation any creative faculty and secondly, is it prepared to fight and die in order to preserve its existence? These two tests have applied to India.

With regard to the first question, we have seen that in spite of the British rule in India, in spite of innumerable restrictions and disadvantages which follow from foreign rule, we have been able to give numerous proofs during the century that in different departments of our national life we still have creative power.

The number of philosophers and thinkers produced in India under British rule, the number of writers and poets that enslaved India has produced, the artistic revival in India in spite of British rule, the scientific progress made by the Indian people in spite of so many difficulties in the way of their education, the standard already attained by our leading scientists as compared with scientists in different parts of the world, the industrial progress

made by India as a result of her own effort and initiative and last but not the least, the distinction which we have attained in the field of sports, all these go to show that in spite of being politically subjugated the vitality of the nation has remained intact.

If under foreign rule and in spite of the obstacles and restrictions that follow from foreign rule, we could give so much proof of our creative faculty, then it stands to reason that when India is free and when the masses of the Indian people are afforded educational facilities, they will be able to give much better proof of their intellectual calibre and creative faculty in different walks of life.

I have just referred to the first test of a nation's vitality, namely, creative faculty. I shall now consider the second test, namely, as to whether the Indian people are able to fight and to die for the sake of freedom. On this point I should like to say, first of all, that, since the last great fight that they had with the British in 1857, the Indian people have not given up the struggle against the enemy, even for one day.

Unfortunately, owing to what I would call the folly of our forefathers, after our final defeat in 1857, the leaders in those days had allowed themselves to be disarmed. Whatever difficulty we have subsequently experienced in winning back our freedom has been due to largely our having been disarmed. But though owing to the mistake of the leaders the people were disarmed, nevertheless they continued to fight for their freedom in other ways.

I shall not take up your time unnecessarily by giving a description of all the methods that have been used in India against the British. I will only say this, that all the methods that have been tried by revolutionists in different parts of the world for the achievement of their own independence have been tried in India.

At the beginning of the century, particularly after the victory of Japan over Russia in 1904 and 1905, the freedom movement in India got a new impetus and since then, during the last 40 years, our revolutionaries have been studying very closely the methods of revolutionaries in other countries and they have tried to adopt as many of their methods as possible. They have tried also to manufacture secretly arms and explosives for the achievement of

independence. As a development of this struggle for freedom, India tried a new experiment-Civil Disobedience or Passive Resistance-of which the best exponent was Mahatma Gandhi. Though personally I believe that this method will not succeed in bringing us complete independence, there is no doubt that it has greatly helped to rouse and unify the Indian people and also to keep up a movement of resistance against the foreign government. I should, therefore, say that the fact that in spite of all the difficulties that result from foreign rule, a nation can produce a new method and practice that method with a large measure of success is also a proof of that nation's vitality. It shows that, that nation does not accept enslavement as a settled fact and is determined to struggle against it and to work out new methods for achieving independence.

I have, as a revolutionary, made a very close study of the revolutionary movements in other countries, and I can say without any exaggeration that since 1857 we have used every possible method of revolutionary struggle. In the course of this struggle, tremendous sacrifices have been made and many have given their lives. There was, however, one method that still remained for us to take up and that was the organization of a real modern national army. That work we had not done up till recently because it was impossible to do that inside India under the eyes of the British army and the British police. But the moment this war gave the Indian people an opportunity of organizing a modern Indian national army outside India they at once seized it. As a result of that effort, and with the help of the Japanese Government and the armed forces of Japan, they have been able to build up this army.

So my point is that throughout our revolutionary struggle against the British Government and their armed forces we have shown sufficient initiative, creative power and vitality and have made tremendous sacrifices. WE now hope that under the conditions, and with the advantages the war has given us, we shall be able, after all, to fulfil our national aspirations and win freedom for India.

Having replied to the question regarding the vitality of the Indian people and their right to live as a free nation, I shall now attempt a sociological analysis of modern India, you have to take

note of the three important factors. The first factor is the ancient background, that is, the ancient culture and civilisation of India, of which the Indian people of today are conscious, and of which they feel proud. The second factor is the struggle which has gone on without any break or interruption since we were finally overpowered by the British. And the third factor consists of certain influences which have come into India from outside.

Modern India is composed of its ancient background, the unbroken national struggle against Britain, and the impact of influences from abroad.

I shall now deal, in some detail with the influences which have reacted on India from outside and which have been responsible, to some extent, in making modern India what it is today. Among these outside influences, the first factor is the influence of Western thought which was crystallized in Liberalism, Constitutionalism and Democracy.

In other words, since 1857, modern liberal and democratic thought has been influencing the intellectuals of India to a large extent.

From the beginning of the present century, a new factor came into operation. After the victory of Japan over Russia in 1904-1905, the eyes of the Indian people were opened to a new movement in Asia—the movement for the revival of not merely of Japan-of other Asiatic countries. Since then, Indian thought has been greatly interested in Asiatic revival. During the last 40 years we have been thinking not merely of what was happening inside India, but also of what was happening in other parts of Asia.

Another important factor which had influenced our mind consisted of the struggles that have gone on in different parts of the world. Indian revolutionaries studied the Risorgimento Movement in Italy inder the leadership of Mazzini and Garibaldi and the struggle of the Irish people against their British oppressors.

In Russia, before the last World War, there was, as you know, a movement against the Czar called Nihilist movement. That also was studied. And nearer India the new awakening of China under the leadership of Dr. Sun Yat-sen was also studied very closely and with great interest by the Indian revolutionaries.

Thus, Indian revolutionaries have been exceedingly receptive to the influences exerted by revolutionary struggles abroad. Then during the last World War, when the revolution broke out in Russia and, as a result of it, a new government-the Soviet Government-came into existence, the work of that Government was studied with great interest in our country.

People in India has not been interested so much in the Communist movement as in the work of reconstruction of Soviet Russia-in rapid industrialisation of that country and also in the way in which the Soviet Government solved the problems of the minorities. It is this constructive achievement of the Soviet Government which was studied with great interest by people in our country. As a matter of fact, intellectuals like our poet Tagore, who had no interest in Communism as such, were profoundly impressed when they visited Russia in the work of educational reconstruction in that country. Then there is another influence which came to India form outside in more recent times-I mean, the new movement in Europe headed by Italy and Germany called Fascism or National Socialism. This movement was also studied by our revolutionaries.

I have just dealt with some of the influences that have reached India form different parts of the world, form England, France, Japan, China, Russia, Germany and so on. I will now take up another question *viz.*, as to how we have reacted to these influences-how much we have accepted and how much we have rejected out of these outside influences.

In dealing with this question of our reaction to these outside influences, I must first point out that there is a big gulf between our generation and the last generation. As typical exponents of the last generation, I would like to mention Tagore and Gandhi. They represent for us the last generation, and between their thoughts and ideas and the thoughts and ideas of our generation there is a big gulf.

If you study the works of Tagore and Gandhi, you will find that all along there is a conflict in their minds as to what their reaction to the Western influence should be. So far as Mahatma Gandhi is concerned, he has never given us any clear solution this problem. He has left people in doubt as to what his attitude is

toward the acceptance of Western ideas. Generally speaking, his attitude is one of antagonism. But in actual practice he has not always acted in accordance with his own ideas, the reason being that the rest of the countrie do not share that hostility or antagonism which Mahatma Gandhi personally has toward Western ideas and concepts. You all know about Mahatma Gandhi's attitude on the question of violence of physical force. He does not advocate the use of arms, or the shedding of blood of the enemy for gaining one's freedom. This attitude towards violence or physical force is closely related to his general attitude toward foreign influence, particularly Western influence.

Our generation has followed Mahatma Gandhi as the leader of a political struggle, but has not accepted his ideas on all these questions. Therefore, it would be a mistake to take Mahatma Gandhi as the exponent of the thoughts and ideas of the present generation in India.

Gandhi is in some ways a complex personality and I would like to analyze his personality, so that you may understand him better. In Gandhi, there are two aspects-Gandhi as a political leader and Gandhi as a philosopher. We have been following him in has capacity as a political leader, but we have not accepted his philosophy.

Now the question arises as to how we can separate the two aspects. Why, if we do not accept his philosophy, are we following him? Though Gandhi has his own philosophy of life, he is a practical politician and therefore, he does not force his own philosophy on the people. Consequently though we are following him in our political struggle, we are free to follow our own philosophy. If Gandhi had tried to thrust his philosophy on us, we would not have accepted him as a leader. But he has kept his philosophy separate from his political struggle.

I have mentioned as representatives and exponents of the last generation Tagore and Gandhi. Now let us compare their philosophies. There are some points in which they agree, but in some other points they do not. The points on which they agree are firstly, that they would like to see the national struggle being conducted with out the use of arms. In other words, on the question of physical force, they have the same views. On the question of

industrialization of the country, they also have the same views. Both Tagore and Gandhi are against modern industrial civilisation. But in realm of culture, their views are not same. So far as thought, art and culture are concerned, Tagore is prepared to accept foreign influence. He believes that in the realm of culture there should be full cooperation between India and the rest of the World and there should be reciprocity.

We should not be hostile or antagonistic to the culture or art or ideas of any other nation. In the realm of culture while Tagore advocates full cooperation between India and rest of the World, Gandhi's general attitude is antagonistic to foreign influence. We must however, remember that Mahatma Gandhi has nowhere given a very clear exposition of his views. I am only referring to his general attitude to this question.

I have previously remarked that there is a big gulf between the fundamental thoughts and ideas of the last generation and our generation. I will now explain what I meant thereby. As I have just said, this problem as to what our reaction should be toward foreign influence and toward industrial civilization troubled the leaders of the old generation all their lives and we see proofs of it in their actions. But, this problem does not exist for us. It does not exist for us, because our starting-point is that we want a modern India based of course on the past. We do not believe that India can achieve freedom with out the use of arms. Now once you take up this attitude, that for winning freedom we have to fight and use arms, it follows that we must have modern industries. What constituted the biggest problem for the old leaders constitutes our starting point. The problem for modern India is not our attitude toward modernism or foreign influence or industrialization, but how we are to solve our present-day problems.

I believe modern Japan will understand our generation much better than modern Japan understood the last generation in India. Our stand is virtually the same. We want to build up a new and modern nation on the basis of our old culture and civilization. For that we need modern industries, modern army and all those things necessary to preserve our existence and our freedom under modern conditions. Having dealt with the fundamental standpoint of my generation. I will go on to discuss some of the detailed

problems. For the present, of course, the biggest problem is how to fight and win this war. But that is a problem of which you are aware from what you have read in the papers or heard over the radio. I will now consider some of the problems of Free India.

The moment India is free, the most important problem will be organizing of our national defence in order to safe guard our freedom in future. For that we shall have to build up modern war industries, so that we may produce the arms that we shall need for self-defence. This will mean a very big programme of industrialization.

After satisfying the needs of our nation in the matter of self-defence, the next problem in the degree of importance will be that of poverty and unemployment. India today is one of the poorest countries in the world, but India was not poor before we came under the British rule. In fact, it was the wealth of India which attracted the European nations to India. One cannot say that in the matter of national wealth or resources India is poor. We are rich in natural resources, but owing to British and foreign exploitation, the country has been impoverished. So our second most important problem will be how to give employment to the millions of unemployed in India and how to relieve the appalling poverty which now exists among the masses of the Indian people.

The third problem in free India will be the problem of education. At present, under British rule, about 90% of the people are illiterate. Our problem will be to give at least an elementary education to the Indian masses as soon as possible, and along with that to give more facilities to the intellectual classes in the matter of higher education.

Connected with the question of education is another problem which is important for India and that is the question of script. In India there are principally two scripts in vogue. One is the script known as Sanskrit (or Nagri) script and the other is Arabic (or Persian) script. Up till today in all national affairs and conferences we have been using both theses scripts. I must ad that in some provinces, there are scripts in vogue which are modifications of Sanskrit script. But fundamentally there are two scripts, and in all national affairs and conferences we have to use both these two scripts.

There is now a movement to solve this problem of scripts by using the Latin script. I personally am an advocate of the Latin script. Since we have to live in the modern world, we have to be in touch with other countries and whether we like it or not, we have to learn the Latin script. If we could make the Latin script the medium of writing throughout the country, that would solve our problem. Anyway that is my own view and the view of my closest friends and collaborators.

I have refereed to three important problems in Free India : National defence, how to remove poverty and how to give education to the people. If we are to solve these three important problems, how are we going to do it? Shall we leave it to private agency and private initiative or will the State take up the responsibility of solving these problems?

Well at present, public opinion in India is that we cannot leave it to private initiative to solve these national problems, especially the economic problem. If we leave it to private initiative to solve the problem of poverty and unemployment, for instance it will probably take centuries. Therefore, public opinion in India is in favour of some sort of socialist system, in which the initiative will not be left to private individuals, but the state will take over the responsibility for solving economic questions. Whether it is a question of industrializing the country or modernizing agriculture we want the State to step in and take over the responsibility and put through reforms within a short period, so that the Indian people could be put on their legs at a very early date.

But in solving this problem we want to work in our own way. We will, naturally, study experiments made in other countries-but, after all, we have to solve our problems in an Indian way and under Indian conditions. Therefore, the system that we shall ultimately set up will be an Indian system to suit the needs of the Indian people.

Now if we do not tackle the economic question from the point of the view of the masses, the majority of who are poor, if we do not do that in India, we shall produce the same confusion or the same difficulties in our country, as we see in China today. You see in China today a split between Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party. Personally I do not see why this should have

occurred or why, if Kuomintang Party has interests of Chinese masses at heart, there should be any need to have a separate party like the Communist Party under foreign influence. Having learnt from experience, we do not want to repeat the mistake that China has made. We actually find today that because the nationalist movement in our generation has identified itself with the peasants who form more than 90% of the people, because we have their interests at heart, there is no raison d'etre for a separate party like the Communist Party. If the nationalists in India did not have the interests of the masses at heart, then you would have seen the same phenomenon as you see in China today.

Now we come to another question-namely, the political system or Government. If we are to have an economic structure of a socialistic character, then it follows that the political system must be such as to be able to carry out that economic programme un the best possible way. You can not have a so-called democratic system, if that system has to put through economic reforms on a socialistic basis. Therefore, we must have a political system-a State-of an authoritarian character. We have had some experience of democratic institutions in India and we have also studied the working of democratic institutions in countries like France, England and the United States of America. And have come to the conclusion that with a democratic system we cannot solve the problems of a Free India. Therefore, modern progressive thought in India is in favour of a State of an authoritarian character, which will work as an organ, or as the servant of the masses, and not clique or of a few rich individuals.

That is our idea with regard to the political institution in Free India. We must have a government that will function as the servant of the people and will have full powers to put through new reforms concerning industry, education, defence, etc., in Free India.

Before I pass into the next problem, I should like to mention another point, namely the attitude of Free India toward religion and caste. This is a question that is frequently asked. India has several religions. Consequently, the Government of Free India must have an absolutely neutral and impartial attitude toward all religions and leave it to the choice of every individual to profess

to follow a particular faith. With regard to caste, that is now no problem for us, because caste, as it existed in the old times, does not exist today. Now, what is caste system? The caste system means that a community is divided into certain groups on a professional or vocational basis and marriage takes place within each group.

In modern India there is no such caste distinction. A member of one caste is free to take up any other profession. So caste, in that sense does not exist today. Then there remains the question of marriage. In the old times, it was custom to marry within each caste. Nowadays, intermarriage between the different castes takes place freely. Hence caste is fast disappearing. As a matter of fact in the nationalist movement we never inquire as to what caste a man belongs to and we even do not know the caste of some of our closest collaborators, which shows that in our generation we do not think at all about caste. For Free India, therefore, caste is no problem at all.

In this connection, I should like to tell you that it was the British who created the impression throughout the world that we are a people quarrelling among ourselves, especially over religion. But that is an absolutely wrong picture of India. It may be that there are certain differences among the Indian people, but such differences you will find in every other country. If we take the so-called progressive countries of the world, *e.g.*, France before the outbreak of the present war, or Germany before Hitler and his Party came to power, you will find that there were acute differences among the people in these countries. Spain had even a first-class civil war.

But nobody ever says that, because the people in these countries had disputes and differences, they are not fit to rule themselves. It is only in case of India that the British say that, because there are certain differences among Indian people therefore they are not fit to be free. Again, the fact is that whatever differences there are among the Indian people are largely the creation of the British Government. There are hundreds of examples to show you that throughout the history of British rule, the British have tried by every possible means to divide the Indian people. After having done so much to artificially create differences among the Indian

people the British turn around and say that we are not fit to be free. I should also point out that if you take a modern power like Soviet Russia and see how heterogeneous the composition of the Soviet Union is, you will realise that if, in spite of this heterogeneous character, so many different races professing so many different religions could be unified in one political system and become such a strong Power, there is absolutely no reason why India which has much more homogeneity than the Soviet Union, should not be united as one nation. As a matter of fact, you will find that outside India, where there is no British influence, there are no differences among the Indian people. In the Independence Movement in East Asia and in the Indian National Army there is no question of religion or caste or class. It is just in India where the British have influence and control that you will find these differences.

On the question of National unity, I should like to give you a friendly warning that British propaganda tries to give the world the impression that the Muslims of India do not support the independence movement. This is wrong. Very often you read in the papers about certain organizations like the Muslim League or the Hindu Mahasabha. The British boost these organizations, because they are in their policy pro-British and are against the Indian National Congress, and they try to make out that the Muslim League represents the Muslims of India. But that is British propaganda. The fact is that the Muslim League and its leader, Mr. Jinnah, represent only a minority of the Indian Muslims. The majority of the Indian Muslims are nationalists and they support the independence movement, as much as anyone else. The President of the Indian National Congress is a Muslim, and so are many other members of the congress, many of whom are in prison today.

These facts are not known to the outside world and the outside world gets the impression that Mr. Jinnah represents all the Muslims of India and that they are not supporting the nationalist movement. So I would like to give out this warning about British propaganda.

I have already told you about the kind of economic and political system that we would like to have in Free India. Out of

this, arises the problem as to what our political philosophy is. On this question, I gave my own views in a book I wrote about 10 years ago called "The Indian Struggle'. In that book I said that it would be our task in India to evolve a system that would be a synthesis of the systems in vogue in different parts of the world. For instance, if you take the conflict between Fascism (or what you might call National Socialism) on the one side and Communism on the other, I see no reason why we cannot work out a synthesis of the two systems that will embody the good points of both. It would be foolish for any one to say that any one system represents the last stage in human progress. As students of philosophy, you will admit that human progress can never stop and out of the past experience of the world we have to produce a new system. Therefore, we in India will try to work out a synthesis of the rival systems and try to embody the good points of both.

Now I would like to compare some of the good points of National Socialism and Communism. You will find some things common to both. Both are called anti-democratic or totalitarian. Both are anti-capitalistic. Nevertheless, in spite of these common points, they differ on other points. When we see National Socialism in Europe today, what do we find? National Socialism has been able to create national unity and solidarity and too improve the condition of the masses. But it has not been able to radically reform the prevailing economic system which was built up on a capitalist basis.

On the other side, let us examine the Soviet experiment based on Communism. You will find one great achievement and that is planned economy. Where Communism is deficient is that it does not appreciate the value of national sentiment. What we in India would like to have is a progressive system which will fulfil the social needs of the whole people and will be based on national sentiment. In other words, it will be a synthesis of Nationalism and Socialism. This is some thing which has not been achieved by National Socialists in Germany today.

There are few points in which India does not follow Soviet Russia. Firstly, class conflict is some thing that is quite unnecessary in India. If the Government of free India begins to work as an organ of the masses, then there is no need for the class conflict.

We can solve our problems by making the State the servant of the masses. There is another point which has been overemphasized by Soviet Russia and that is the problem of the working classes. India being predominantly a country of peasants, the problem of the peasants will be more important than the problem of the working classes.

Another point on which we do not fully agree is that, according to Marxism, too much importance is given to the economic factor in human life. We fully appreciate the importance of the economic factor which was formerly ignored, but it is not necessary to overemphasize it.

To repeat once again our political philosophy should be a synthesis between National Socialism and Communism. The conflict between thesis and antithesis has to be resolved in a higher synthesis. This is what the law of the Dialectic demands. If this is not done, then human progress will come to an end. India will, therefore, try to move to the next stage of political and social evolution. I will now pass on the last point in my address, and that is our conception of an international order. On this point I have already spoken several times in Tokyo. I fully support the steps that have been taken through the Joint Declaration to create a new order in East Asia on the basis of freedom, justice and reciprocity. I have been personally greatly interested in international problems, having tried to work in several countries in order to get support for our movement and, in that connection; I also had the opportunity of studying the work of the League of Nations.

The experiment of the League of Nations has failed, and it is desirable and profitable for us to investigate as to why it failed. If I were to answer that I would say that it failed because the sponsor-nations were too selfish and short-sighted. The sponsor-nations were England, France and America. America dropped out of the League, so the Powers that controlled the League were England and France.

Now these two leading Powers, instead of setting an example of unselfishness, tried to use the League of Nations for their selfish interests and for their own benefit. The only basis on which we can set up an international order is freedom, justice and reciprocity.

Therefore, the work in East Asia has commenced on the right lines and on the right basis. The only task that remains for us is to see that in actual work the principles embodied in the Joint Declaration are put into effect. If they are so put into effect, then the experiment will be a success. If not, then it will again prove to be a failure.

You must have seen in my speeches and press statements that I have been very enthusiastic about this Joint Declarations. There are several reasons. Firstly, it is on the right basis and on the right lines that the work has began. Secondly, if you want to set up an international order, it has to have a beginning in a particular region. If we make it a success in one region, it can gradually be expanded all over the world.

It is very difficult to set up a world order suddenly out of nothing and make it a success. But if you begin in one region where friendship and reciprocity between the nations can be developed, and if in that region you meet with success, then that example will be emulated by other nations in other parts of the world. So the method of setting up of a regional order is the only way in which a world order can gradually be built up.

The third reason is that I have found that this idea or plan find support among the mass of the people if this country, and especially among the youths. If I had found that this new order was being sponsored by a few politicians or leaders and that the rest of the nation was apathetic or indifferent, I should certainly not be optimistic. But it is because I have found that the people as a whole, and especially the youths are vitally interested in it and support it enthusiastically, that I believe that through the cooperation of the leaders and the people and the youths, it can be made a success. I should like to repeat that this undertaking is for the Government and the people of this country a very great responsibility. As you know, your Government was responsible for sponsoring this idea, so you are the sponsor-nation. The success of this experiment will depend on the example set by the sponsor-nation.

The League of Nations failed, because the sponsor-nations were selfish and short-sighted. This time if the nations that have joined together, and particularly the sponsor-nation, avoid a selfish and short-sighted policy and work on moral basis, then I see no

reason why the experiment should not be a success. I should like to emphasize again the tremendous responsibility which Japan has undertaken by becoming the sponsor-nation in this task. And when I talk of the responsibility of the nation, I want also to stress the responsibility of the youths. The youths of today will be the nation and leaders of tomorrow. An idea that is welcomed and supported by the youths will one day be supported by the whole nation. But an idea which does not find support among the youths will die a natural death. Therefore, their responsibility for making this new order a success devolves, in the last analysis, on the youths of this country. I hope and pray and trust that the youths and the students who are the future representatives of the nation will realise the tremendous moral responsibility which Japan has undertaken in initiating this new order.

There may be people who doubt whether a nation can rise to a high moral level, whether a nation can be farsighted and unselfish and undertake the work of establishing a new order. I have every faith in mankind. If it is possible for one individual to be unselfish, to live one's life at a high moral level, I see no reason why an entire nation cannot also rise to that level. In the history of the world we have seen examples in which a revolution has changed the mentality of a whole nation and made it rise to a high level of morality. Therefore, if anybody has any doubt whether an entire nation can rise to that level, then I do not share that doubt.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the sponsor-nation should realize the tremendous responsibility that it has undertaken. This is a task not only for the leaders and the politicians, but for the whole nation and especially for those who are the hopes of the nation-the youths and the students.

GLIMPSES OF NETAJI

Two questions which I am often asked about Netaji are, one about his personality and another about his life. The first question is, what was so exceptional in his ability which attracted and inspired those who came in touch with him? Whenever I am asked this question, I am reminded of the fable of "The Elephant and the blind men." Like one of those men I could not scan that

great man Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose in totality. So before saying what I could perceive, let the reader allow me to look at him through the eyes of those who had better vision than I.

SA Ayer, Minister for Publicity and Propaganda of Azad Hind Government had this to say in his book *Unto him a witness*. "The title of Supreme Commander, if it truly fitted any commander on the battlefields of Europe or Asia, fitted Netaji most superbly. He looked supreme, every inch of him. The way he talked and moved with the soldiers on or off the war front was one of supreme dignity and self-confidence.

The word personality assumed a meaning when Netaji, in his Supreme Commander's Uniform, stepped on to the saluting base and faced the serried ranks of the INA. And yet, the uniform itself was the simplest in the world, no medals in a row, no shining leather belt or shoulder straps, nor a sword in its scabbard hanging from his waist, nor a horse ride. Whatever clothes he wore, he wore them smartly. Normally he wore khaki cotton clothes except when he visited Japan. There he had to use Khaki woollens as a protection against the severe cold weather. His forage cap with two tiny well polished brass buttons in the front sat majestically on his bright and broad forehead, the face beneath the cap of a rosy wheat complexion, now inscrutable. Immobile, dignified, now wreathed in a charming smile, now reminded one of the Bengal Tiger as when he roared an inspiring exhortation to soldiers or civilians at mammoth gatherings. It was impossible to take one's eyes of his face whenever he ascended the platform; he held one spellbound by its compelling magnetism ...."

Now let me show another glimpse of Netaji's creative qualities when he drafted the Proclamation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind. After a long busy day, a day just earlier to 21st October 1943, it was past midnight. This is what Ayer says:

> *"Then I witnessed a phenomenon. I had glimpse of the great man. He took hold of a bunch of quarter-sheets of blank paper, took pencil in hand and started writing, 'After their first defeat in the hands of the British in 1757 in Bengal ....'*

He did not lift his eyes from the paper in front of him, silently handed to me the first page as soon as he finished it, and I walked

out of the room and sat at the type writer. Abid and Swami went to his room in turn and brought me the Proclamation manuscript, sheet after sheet, as Netaji finished it. What amazed me was that he never even once wanted to see any earlier pages that he had written. How he could remember every word that he had written in the preceding pages, how he could remember the sequence of the paragraphs? In the entire script there was not one word corrected or scored out, and the punctuation was complete.

That he wrote out the whole proclamation sheet after sheet without break and at one sitting was some measure of Netaji's clear thinking, remarkable memory and grasp and facile pem! The entire historic proclamation was written with the ease with which a brief letter could be penned."

The proclamation shows Netaji's extraordinary grasp of history.

Alexander Werth, one of the important Liaison Officers at the Free India Centre, in Chapter Four, "Planning for Revolution-1941-1943", in the book, *A Beacon Across Asia*, edited by Sisir K Bose, Alexander Werth and SA Ayer (published by Orient Longman) has observed (page 127):

"Those who observed Bose during these years were all greatly impressed by the fact he succeeded so well in convincing all his co-workers-both Indian and German-about the great importance of the work they were doing and inspiring them with a sense of mission, common objectives and mutual cooperation. Whenever there were differences of opinion or misunderstanding or even quarrels amongst his colleagues, he showed his remarkable capacity of keeping the thread of all activities of his political, military and technical co-workers in his hands so that the over all control of the whole organisation remained with him. He was the driving spirit behind all activities of the Free India Center. He succeeded in doing so much inspite of the fact that the organisation that he built up was something between an official mission and a provisional government and no so fully recognized association of a group of exiles from India."

Earlier, after his arrival in Berlin, Netaji went under the name of Orlando Mazzota for quite some time. He intended to remain

in anonymity till he could bring round the Axis Powers to declare that the Independence of India was among their war aims. He also did not wish the British to know about his whereabouts. Without going into details of how difficult his task was, let me quote HN Pandit's work-*Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose from Kabul to Battle of Imphal* (Sterling Publishers Limited-Page 38):

For the whole story we have to turn to the narration of MR Vyas who was one of the first four associates of Netaji in Germany when Bose was still known as Orlando Mazzotta.

"It seems an emissary of the Foreign Office went to Badgastein (where Bose was staying) with the German Government's request for cooperation. Subhash thanked the German Government for the proposal and added that the collaboration would have to be based on a very well defined agreement. His terms were:

For all purpose of negotiation, India should be regarded as a completely sovereign state of which he would be the representative until such time as the Indian people could finally constitute their own Government on their own soil.

While India remained subjugation, he (Netaji) should have facilities for a separate free establishment of his own with the status of a diplomatic representative attached to the Head of a sovereign state.

For the finances of such a set up, the German Government should advance an interest free loan which would be repayable by India after the termination of hostilities.

The loan so granted must be without any condition and the expenditure for the same must be subject to diplomatic immunity.

Any broadcasts, any publications or any publicity to be carried on by the establishment so contemplated, must not be subject to any German censorship even though the same may have to be carried on from territories of Germany under her occupation.

Recruitment to any National Army to be raised would be made solely by Indians or representatives duly approved by the head of the state, i.e. Subhash Chandra Bose. The oath of allegiance by the members of the Army would be to Subhash Chandra Bose who as the Head of the Sovereign State of India, would also be the Commander-in-chief of all India armed forces.

Though apparent from above, still it must be specially agreed that the Indian forces, while operating in any joint sub-command, must not be deployed on any front other than against the British or other troops under the British command subject to any unforeseen military entanglements. While the free India establishment and its forces would support all anti British actions, it would not ipso facto consider itself at war with the other allies of Great Britain. The Nazis were flabbergasted to see the terms. Were these conditions of a powerless one-man state for cooperation with the Reich? The man must be cut to size. The task was assigned to one of Ribbentrop's senior officers who came to meet Bose in the Foreign Office with an SS Colonel accompanying him in the mission. The following account of the conversation which took place has been given by Vyas:

> *"Your Excellency", Ribbentrop's officer began, "While we realise on many questions, don't you think that after your having come here, there could be no activity of any kind unless the German government voluntarily agrees to it?"*

Subhash Chandra Bose replied: "Do you mean that you could put me in prison if I do not agree to work on your terms?"

"Certainly not, Your Excellency", the SS Colonel interposed, "but you would be incapacitated and will have to remain inactive."

Bose: "If I wanted to remain inactive I would have remained in a British prison. But this war provides a unique chance for my country to be free. So I would rather go else where or even to India and fight from there, come what may."

The Foreign Office representative commented sarcastically, "But Your Excellency, even for leaving Germany, you will require our permission, isn't it?"

Apparently the officer bargained for more than he could afford, because the reply that came stunned him. : "Sir, I have heard a lot about your Gestapo. Probably the gentleman here is a representative of that body. But believe me, the British CID in India is no less efficient and ruthless. And if I have failed them and escaped, I shall do the same here. I have not come here to live the life of an exile. Gentleman, I think we shall leave it at that." The meeting came to an end abruptly.

This happened in the second half of October 1941. For two days nothing happened. Then Ribbentrop (the Minister for Foreign affairs) had a meeting with Subhash Chandra Bose in a very friendly way. Shortly afterwards an official communication arrived that fuehrer (Hitler) had approved the civil parts of Netaji's terms from points 1 to 5. The decision on the military points too followed in due course of time with some minor modifications. Vyas says that although there was tough bargaining in the beginning, once the agreement was signed, the Germans honoured it in letter and spirit.

The Free India Center with the status of a diplomatic mission was established with its office in Lichtensteiner Allee, opposite to the Spanish Embassy in Berlin's diplomatic enclave. After having lived in various hotels, Subhash Chandra Bose was allotted a villa in the Charlottenburg area of Berlin. Before the out break of the war, this house was occupied by the military attache to the American Embassy.

The work of the Free India Center began with a few Indian Volunteers, mainly students. To start with, they were MR Vyas, NG Gunpulay, NG Swamy, Habib-ur-Rehman, Abid Hassan Safrani and one or two more. It can be said that more than a diplomatic mission, the Free India Center worked like the secretariat of a Government to be free. India movement came to be called Azad Hind, with its emblem of Tricolour with the springing tiger and Jana Gana Mana adopted Hindi words *Subh Sukh Chain Ki Barkha Barse*-without any alteration in the tune. Jai Hind was adopted as the greetings amongst the Indian nationals. It gave us a special identity as members of one nation irrespective of many religions and races. Our leader Subhash Chandra Bose was addressed by the members of the Azad Hind as Netaji. This title owes its introduction to the members of the Azad Hind Free India Centre. In Hindustani, 'Neta' means leader, the suffix 'Ji' is a common word of respect and courtesy used among equals and among the high and low alike. It sounds of closeness between the person addressed and the addresser in contrast to words like *Hazoor, Sahib, Janab, Nawab-e-Aala, Janab-e-Aali, Sahib Bahadur, Shriman, Sarkar, Alijab, Hukum*, etc. The word Netaji became so popular that it immediately reminds one of Netaji Subhash

Chandra Bose. There have been 'netas', many of them will come and go but Netaji will remain only one and one only Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

BOSE IN TOKYO

About Netaji's early days in Tokyo, Dr. Joyce Lebra in her book, Jungle Alliance has this to say: "After several week on a submarine Bose was exhausted and in need of rest. But he had one aim in Tokyo, an obsession. He had to meet Premier Tojo. Yamamoto after a few days arranged meetings with Army Chief of Stuff Sugiyama, Foreign Minister Shigemitsu, Navy Minister Yonai, and various section chiefs of the Army, Navy and Foreign Ministers. Bose's opening words to Sugiyama took the Chief of Stuff by surprise. "The war will end in victory for Japan!" Bose boomed. Japan was in the midst of adverse circumstances in Guadacanal and the campaign was obviously not going well for Japan, perhaps Bose's statement was a material resource. Bose continued with out waiting for a response from the bemused Chief of Staff, "Will Japan send soldiers to India or not? We are going to fight our way to India step by step. If we don't push on with determination we won't be able to achieve Independence."

"The immediate reaction of Sugiyama was that Bose had none on the humility or reserve a Japanese would have shown in such an interview. But there was no doubting his sincerity of his aims. He was a known quantity, whatever Operations Bureau of IGHQ thought of his value to Japan. Sugiyama, despite his interest and sympathy derived from two year's experience in India, could only respond to Bose with a briefing about Japan's current military position. Bose, dissatisfied with Sugiyama's general discussion, explained with great fervour his hope of first taking Chittagong, then pushing on into Bengal. Sugiyama assured Bose of his sympathy with Bose's aspirations, and Bose's first interview in Tokyo ended more calmly than it had begun. But Bose was dissatisfied. He had to meet Tojo and get Japanese commitment. Yamamoto, meanwhile acting as a guide for Bose, for ten days escorted him through factories, schools and hospitals, trying to distract his attention from Tojo and keep him occupied. Bose was impressed with what he saw but not deterred from his object.

"Why was Tojo putting Bose off? In the first place, there were many other pressing military problems than India, and Tojo's please that he was too busy were not simply excuses. Secondly, there was group in the Operations Bureau of IGHQ which took a dim view of India and the INA. The INA had no direct relevance to military strategy and operations in Pacific or even Southeast Asia, and there was no proof of Bose's propaganda impact within India in any case. But the main reason for Tojo's reluctance to meet Bose was Tojo's own often formed opinion of a man before meeting him. The INA had been only a headache so far as Tojo was concerned. The trouble between Mohan Singh and Rash Behari Bose had disposed Tojo unfavourably towards the INA. And the demands in the Bangkok Resolution Tojo regarded as presumptuous. How could a small revolutionary group which did not even represent a government presume to make demands on the Imperial Government of Japan? There was no need for Tojo to meet another Indian, even if he had just come from Berlin.

"It was persuasion by Sugiyama and Shigemitsu which at length prevailed on Tojo to meet Bose. On 10th June the first of the two meetings took place. The magic of Bose enhanced Tojo immediately. It had been the same with Sugiyama, Shigemitsu and nearly everyone Bose met, whether Japanese or Indians. Apart from the impact of Bose's words and passionate devotion to Indian Independence, there was some thing about his face, his voice and his eyes that captured the minds and hearts of men. Tojo was enthralled.

The meeting was brief but fruitful exchange of views, between Bose and Tojo. Tojo explained Japan's ideas on the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Bose, with his customary frankness, asked Tojo, "Can Japan give unconditional help to the Indian independence movement? I would like to confirm that there are no strings attached to Japanese aid." Tojo immediately gave Bose an affirmative reply. Bose continued, "Can the Japanese army push its operations into India proper?" This time there were complex military matters involved, and Tojo was unable to answer as decisively. But Bose had been favourably impressed and was grateful he had made a friend in Tojo. If Bose was to secure meaningful help from Japan for the INA, Tojo's sympathy and

cooperation was the crucial point. In this Bose had succeeded admirably, and Tojo was ready to make public his official support to Bose and the INA.

On 16 June Bose visited the House of Peers in the 82nd Extraordinary Session of the Diet. Tojo made a historic address on the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere which attracted attention outside Japan. Bose listened intently in the audience to interpreters as Tojo said, "India has been for centuries under cruel rule. We wish to express righteous indignation at their agony and sympathy for their aspirations for complete independence. We firmly resolve that Japan will do everything possible to help Indian independence, I am convinced the day of Indian freedom and prosperity is not far off…" Tojo spoke too of the emancipation of all of East Asia. This was not Tojo's first mention of India in the Diet. Early in 1942 he had spoken of the Pacific war as an opportunity for India to rise against British Rule. But, this time when Tojo promised aid and cooperation for Indian Independence Bose was listening in his audience and felt Tojo was making him a promise which he would follow through."

In the 11th Chapter of this treatise I narrated how cool, fearless and graceful was Netaji under fire. Now I wish to portray in General Shah Nawaz Khan's own words from his book, My Memories of INA & Its Netaji (Rajkamal Publications, Delhi-page 179) another picture of Netaji under fire. "He listened to me very calmly, because he knew that all that I said came from the very depths of my heart and was prompted by my extreme anxiety for his safety, he just smiled and said, "Shah Nawaz, it is no use pleading with me, I have made up my mind to go to Popa and I am going there. You don't have to worry about my safety, as I know England has not yet produced the bomb that can kill Subhash Chandra Bose."

This last statement appeared particularly true, as Netaji seemed to lead a charmed life. That afternoon the place he was living in was heavily bombed by Sixty B-25. They caused terrible devastation all around, and it was difficult to imagine how Netaji escaped with out even a scratch. All of us had failed to persuade Netaji not to proceed any further, but once he had made up his mind no one could change it."

Dr. Ba Maw, the War time President of Myanmar wrote a paper which was read out on his behalf at Netaji Research Bureau, Calcutta on one of the Netaji's Birthdays. I reproduce some of the excerpts out of it as under:

"Taking a historical view now that the time has made it possible, Netaji is by any measure an Asian figure whose shadow stretched out across the whole of this part of the world during the last war and has remained there ever since. As one who was with him throughout most of the war years, I assure you that I what I have just said is true. I myself have seen it happen. I witnessed almost from the beginning to end Netaji's work and achievements during those years, how he moulded out of the rawest possible materials lying scattered throughout all Southeast Asia an Independent Indian State and Government and Army and made them a positive force in the World War. A single mind and will turned a dream into a reality. It purposed the Indian dream across half of the world, through the Middle East, and then into Russia and Germany, then to the furthest edge of Asia, and finally to Burma and or a few delirious weeks and his dream set aflame the hearts of three million of his countrymen who answered his call from every office and bazaar and workshop throughout Southeast Asia and gave him practically everything he asked for within an year of Bose's coming. Azad Hind was a full fledged state recognized by nine other states; it had acquired a large part of territory; its armies were fighting on eight sectors of Burma-India border and soon set foot on Indian soil, proudly planted the flag of free India on it and came within a few inches of winning a decisive victory there when all that really forged out of a single dream crashed together with half of the world."

Dr. Ba Maw goes on: "However to say something, I asked Netaji what he intended to do next. "Why", he replied calmly lighting a cigarette. "Start again and go on fighting when ready. What else can we do? The fight certainly has to go on." These were echoed my own thoughts so much that I nearly wept to hear them. In my case of course, with Burma and Burmese Army in the hand of the British and nothing ready in my hands I would not be able to do any thing, at least for some time. I explained that to Netaji

and he understood completely. Later I heard that he told his men, "Now that Germany and Italy are out of the war, we must continue it with the Japanese as long as they are still in it; and if they too are knocked out we must fight on by ourselves." Those words spoken during the greatest crisis of his life sum up the essential spirit and character of the man. Time masses and powerful men in their day come and go, and a few of them, a very few, leave behind memories which live on and even grow by themselves with the years. Such men become part of the ultimate story of their people. There is every reason to believe that Subhash Chandra Bose is among those few men, I need not say more."

Netaji's personality appealed so much to us that he would ever remain and live as a superhuman hero in imagination of not only us who has the good luck to work with him but also in the imagination of our people. His spirit of patriotism is bound to manifest itself in the future generations and serve not only India and Asia but also the world. His very name commanded our subconscious mind without knowing and thus brought out the latent good lying deep down in and individual. Imagine a jawan having been awarded death punishment for committing heinous crime, i.e. rape and when given the option to appeal to Netaji against my award, the man cried out, "No sir, shoot me here rather than sending me to Netaji. Now I have no face which I can show him (ab main Netaji ko kya moonh dikhaunga?)

I am reminded of the man who when admonished by his Section Commander for exposing himself to the enemy fire, the raw recruit retorted, "How can I be killed today when Netaji himself has sent me a pair of boots?" It was that confidence in Netaji which made us face a enemy superior to us in all respects.

In his book *Builders of Modern India-Subhash Chandra Bose* (Dr. Girija K Mookerjee (Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India) on page 104 says:

> *"The question to all of us is then: Will Subhash be remembered by the generations to come? I think he will. At least it was for this recompense that his restless soul traversed oceans and foreign lands in search of an answer to India's freedom. It is too horrible to think that he is no longer amongst us, to his colleagues he will remain ever alive, ever green and immoral.*

> *He imposed on them his vivid personality so well and they at least will not forger him so long as they live, but I hope those who will come after them will also gratefully remember this magnificent man, born to be a 'grand signeur' who lived and died so that India could be great and so that men and women of our race may have not to be born into this world with the stigma of being a subject people and not free and independent as we are today".*

> *Long back in the thirties, Rabindranath Tagore called Netaji* Deshnayak-*Leader of the Country. During the INA crisis when General Seizo Arisue, Second-in-Command of the Japanese Imperial Army General Staff invited Rash Bihari Bose in order to know his mind about Netaji's coming and discreetly asked, "Netaji is desirous of coming over here and I wonder how you would treat him." The old revolutionary quietly replied, "Netaji is a born leader of Leader's. I shall of course be quiet pleased to ask him to take over from me." I am also reminded of a conversation with General Fujiwara during my visit to Japan in Autumn 1974, we were passing along General Tojo's house reminiscing of the war days. I asked the General about Prime Minister Tojo's opinion about Netaji. Fujiwara replied that General Tojo was so much impressed by Netaji that he said, 'If there exists a man of the Century, he is one whom I met today." Fujiwara believed that if Netaji had arrived in the East earlier, we would have won the war.*

After citing the above impressions of some of the great men who happen to see Netaji from a close range, now I will try to sum up my answer to the questions as under:

> *Netaji practiced what he preached. There was never any difference in his words and deeds*-unki kathni aur karni mein koi farak na tha.

Netaji cared not only for the honour, welfare and comfort of his but also respected their feelings. He had a compassionate nature. He overwhelmed us with his concern for us individually and collectively, like sending a pair of boots to a sepoy with instructions to Regimental Commander to see personally that it fitted the man and report back to Netaji, offering a cigarette case to a veteran commander from Imphal, helping his own staff officers

to wash hands, shedding tears with immediate steps to supply relief. Such spontaneous feelings coming out of his heart made him extraordinarily a rare leader of men in war. His men felt happy, proud and lucky to do and die under his command. It was this relationship which kept up our morale in spite of all our difficulties and deficiencies.

Netaji's knowledge of history of wars fought on different battlefields of the world could easily surpass the knowledge of any seasoned General. He read a lot and did his homework on the subject and he had to deal with. When we had to see anybody he would learn all about the person and his problems before the interview. The result was that the man could go back happy and contented that the Supreme Commander knew him intimately. An interview with Netaji went a long way in creating that confidence without which it is impossible to wage a revolutionary war.

He had a gift of judging the character of a man which served him to put the right man at the right place at the right time in the right job. He picked up some of us from the dust and made heroes out of us.

He never failed to appreciate when appreciation was due. A good word from him made us to strive to do our job well. He had a very kind heart, so kind that he never punished anybody. He always gave a defaulter an advice so that the defaulter could improve himself.

He had remarkable power of observation and could predict any eventuality correctly. Once he wrote a small note to me on the margins of a routine order. It was scribbled in his own hand. He told me that as the mail was getting ready to be dispatched, he wanted to advice me that instead of expecting the enemy at a particular point which I had reported in my previous report, I should also watch at a point. He gave 6 figured map reference. The note was written in Rangoon about 500 kms away from me. When I received it I was surprised at the accuracy of Netaji's judgment. I was already facing the enemy where he had told me to watch. This was measure of Netaji's skill at generalship. Again, I am reminded of my conversation with him when he gave me the command of The Nehru Brigade-4, the Guerrilla Regiment. I said, 'Netaji, may I know how long will it take me to get in touch with the enemy?"

Netaji's reply was, "Well, you are already on the foremost defended locality. There are no positions held between you and the enemy. It all depends on how long the enemy takes to reach the Irrawaddy. The initiative lies with them. You may be lucky to get sixty or seventy days before you are attacked, I guess."

Netaji's guess was accurate. I took my command in mid November 1944. I got to grips with the enemy in February 1945. Another example of Netaji's military foresight is when in March 1939 during the annual session, he proposed that the Congress should at once send ultimatum to the British Government demanding independence with in six months and should prepare immediately for a national struggle. The proposal was opposed by the rightist leaders. Netaji's proposal was based on appreciation of the European situation which was some thing beyond the understanding of our political leaders. But Netaji's prediction turned out to be correct.

The war did break out within six months on 3rd September 1939. Similarly Netaji's of repeated statement, "There is no power on earth that can keep India enslaved. India shall be free and before long." The enemy officers used to mock at the statement which they thought was illusory and face-saving device. Actually Netaji had a plan which was beyond the comprehension of professional soldiers. He kept the INA in the field even in the face of defeat. He wanted us to pay the price of liberty not only when we were on advance but also during the retreat while going away from India not to win a territory but to continue fighting against the British forces who were holding India in perpetual bondage. These forces consisted of a greater number of the Indian soldiers who paused and pondered as to why the INA with their poor strength and poorer equipment yet higher spirit were fighting against the British. It created a psychological revolution. The war ended and with it ended the slavish mentality of the Indian soldier. When the British started the INA trials in the Red Fort they thought that the Indian people, especially the soldiers would appreciate the British action against the INA officers. Reverse was the case.

As soon as the first INA trial of the three front line commanders started on 5th November 1945, within a week disturbances broke out in Lahore, then in Lucknow and in Calcutta where hundreds of demonstrators were injured and twenty killed by the police firing. Even after the first INA trial in which the three accused officers were released by the Commander in Chief, the public demand to stop the future INA trials continued. Anti British Raj feelings kept on rising unabated. The climax came with the mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy in Bombay during February 1946. There were further disturbances in Royal Indian Air Force in Karachi and certain units of the Armed forces in Jabalpore. The British Top brass were for a strict action. The British were however lucky that Field Marshal Sir Claude Auchinleck, the Commander in Chief in India could read the writing in the wall. Netaji's stratagem had transformed the British Indian Army into the Indian Army. The days of the British Raj in India were close to their end.

Having shown Netaji's powers of Generalship which turned the defeat of the INA into the defeat of the British Raj, let me record that another great asset in Netaji's being was that he was at once secular. Whatever our religion and the area or the situation of our birth, we had full confidence that we would get absolute justice from him and his Government-the forerunner of our Government today. To show how his mind worked in this direction, his brief but an all-embracing idea of independence is shown in distilled form in the last but one para of the Proclamation of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind :

> *" The provisional Government is entitled to, and hereby claim the allegiance of every Indian. It guarantees religious liberty, as well as equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens. It declares its firm resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally and transcending all the differences cunningly fostered by an alien government in the past."*
>
> *JAI HIND*

Netaji-The Leader with a Mission

Writing about Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose is a journey down memory lanes, a journey that's both painful and exhilarating: painful in the way he was taken away from us before he could see his dreams come true and I am filled with an overwhelming feeling of sadness because he is still being missed today; exhilarating in the way my admiration for this great man grows day by day.

He certainly had an extraordinary aura that was difficult to ignore. He touched the lives of thousands of Indians in the manner in which he lived. To me, Netaji has been a source of great inspiration, a way to live life sans fear. He personified the courage never to yield. He had the mettle to swim against the tide. He won people's hearts by the sheer force of his personality and he commanded energies beyond the average I have never known anybody with his strength of will. He was formidable in so many ways: as a reformer, a revolutionary leader, and administrator, a statesman, an ambassador, a planner…How many talent is it fair for one man to have!

I remember Netaji as a man of magnetic charm, a man of iron will, determination, dedication, discipline, immense stamina and a proclivity for hard work. He acquired the reputation of being different. And more importantly he was a man who possessed that elusive quality-strength of character.

Character is about deciding the course of your life and staying by it, no matter what comes in the way. It was well known that he revolted against anything that was not fair to human. As a student in the Presidency College, be became involved in beating up of Professor Oaten who had apparently mishandled a student. Whether young Bose was directly involved or not is not known, but his leadership was taken for granted and he was expelled form College in 1916. This incident had an everlasting impact in the mind of this proud under graduate: in his own eyes he became a victim of racial prejudice. Racial hatred ate into his soul and he made it his mission to show himself and India superior to the white-faced foreigner.

A year later he joined the Scottish Church Collage and took to studies with a new zest. He joined the University unit of the Territorial Army and put on a soldiers uniform. His military training was to stand him in a good stead when 25 years later he led an armed revolt against the British. It can be safely said that

the Scottish Church College has done much in producing a person of his calibre. Again when he decided to give up the coveted ICS service and dedicate himself to the service of the Motherland, he knew he was taking a major decision of his lifetime. He said, "I must either chuck this rotten service and dedicate myself wholeheartedly to the country's cause, or I must bid adieu to all my ideas and aspirations." To the Under-Secretary of State of India he said, "…I did not think that one could be loyal to the British Raj and yet serve India honestly, heart and soul." The bell rang in his heart, India calling. And the rest is history.

Later in life when Netaji arrived on the Indian scene, the going was tough and those who appeared though couldn't get going. He brought in a different mind set altogether. When the whole nation was singing hosannas of Gandhiji and his doctrine of Ahimsa, Netaji was marching to the beat of a different drum-armed combat. He had a little or no faith in the idea of nonviolence. He felt that the British would understand only the language of the sword and any inaction on the part of the Indians would be inferred as weakness, as a sign of subordination. He had seen what revolution had accomplished in the other parts of the world. He sought to instil this fighting sprit among all Indians. He was dreamy. He was unconventional. The masses sensed the mood. Scepticism turned to admiration, criticism lost out to felicitations. He no longer looked ordinary. He looked different. In Netaji there were courage and mission: he possessed one and pursued the other. That's a powerful combination. His perseverance paid of. It was the beginning of a new dawn.

Character is about staying calm in the face of adverse crisis. Whatever the danger, Netaji was always a picture of calm and control. He missed death by inches several times and yet remained unperturbed. Once when he along with Major Abid Hassan was travelling by submarine from Germany to Japan, they were attacked by Allied submarines several times and at times the danger was great but Netaji remained a picture of calm. He coolly turned to Abid Hassan to whom he was dictating a letter and asked him, "… Hassan Sahib, what is the last word you have taken down…". Such control is indeed rare to find. Physically her was weak but his mental stamina proved to be his major strength.

Character is about hanging in there and taking your chances. He took the chance on things other people won't. This proved to be his forte. Look at the way he escaped from India in 1941. When the Second World War broke out, he decided to make his move. The long wait had been worth the while, for Netaji sent out the unequivocal message that he was indeed a man of thought and action, that he meant business which for the British implied that their days in India were numbered. The breakthroughs, the things that save countless lives and change history have never come from conventional wisdom. They have never come from playing safe. His escape was bold, daring and risky, dramatic and high voltage. Everything planned to the smallest detail. Netaji took his chance when it came and won the game.

Character is about being humane. The touchingly human side of this great man shines through small incidents. The way in which he would care for us, the INA Tokyo cadets, is still fresh in my mind. He would give us his share of food because he knew that it was in short supply and also because he thought we needed it more. In his letters to us, each word that he wrote touched a chord in our hearts and we wept with joy and love for this great leader of ours. This compassionate concern shown by Netaji drew us even closer to him, so much so that we were willing to gamble with our lives at his demand. During the war when the INA soldiers were given the option of surrendering, they embraced death with a smile and with cries of Jai Hind! There were some who wouldn't allow their wounds to be attended to because they recalled Netaji's promise, "Give me blood and I shall give you freedom…!" these men believed that by bleeding to death, they were being of service to Mother India. Such unshakable faith in their leader!

In today's times, forget following you leader, we don't even have an iota of respect for them. Our ancestors handed down a legacy of knowledge and wisdom, character and integrity, values they had imbedded form their forefathers, thinkers, sages scholars. We, the present generation, have wasted away all those primary values that are imperative for the growth of any nation. We have squandered the lessons that Netaji wanted to teach us. Lessons of valour, Lessons of self-discipline, Lessons of patriotism, Lessons

of self-service. This he learnt form the great Swami Vivekananda. He was greatly influenced by the writings of the Swami who propagated salvation through service to humanity. How selflessly he did service to Mother India is evident in all his actions. Vivekananda's teachings also helped him in his years of imprisonment where he learnt to think and not to brood. He was truly a unique phenomenon. A man who aroused thousands of Indians with his one resounding battle-cry of 'Delhi Chalo". There was something in his words that went beyond mere words. There was passion. There was sincerity. There was confidence. He was the true Neta, one who was able to command the respect of his men. In his speech of the INA in Singapore of 5th July 1943, he said, "For the present, I can offer you nothing except hunger, thirst, privation, forced marches and death. But if you follow me in life and death…I shall lead you to victory and freedom." To this great man we must give due credit for he made heroes out of ordinary men, students, shopkeepers the common man. He formed the Balak Sena comprising of young boys and inculcated in them the sprit of patriotism, discipline and pride of being Indian. His respect and belief in the womenfolk of our country led to the formation of woman's regiment-The Rani of Jhansi Regiment-and it played an active part in the war. He told them, "…When I express my confidence that you are today prepared to fight and suffer for the sake of your mother land, I do not mean only to cajole you with empty words. I know the capabilities of our womanhood well. I can, therefore, say with certainty that there is no task which our women cannot undertake and no sacrifice and suffering which our women cannot undergo…". Under him the women never lagged behind anybody and along with the men folk they also faced lathi charge by the merciless British Police and faced privations of prison life, torture and humiliations. This army did the services of Florence Nightingale and fought fearlessly like the famous Joan of Arc.

Netaji also formed the Reconstruction Brigade where he hired doctors, lawyers, administrators and engineers and involved them in all activities in the freedom movement. He made arrangements with the Japanese authorities to send students to Japan for further training. I was among the 45 students selected by Netaji himself for the training. Till this day I treasure the moments spent with

Netaji and my souvenirs include letters written by Netaji to us. He was able to mobilize not just resources but total involvement of all Indians. Such was his charisma. He was also able to restore the lost confidence of 40,000 demoralised soldiers who had surrendered to Japan. He found in them a wealth of conscience and in his own way prepared them for the ultimate sacrifice for the prestige of our country. They fought many heroic battle for which the present generation should be proud of. He was very clear in his mind that the path he had adopted was strewn with difficulties and even death. He said, "…It does not matter who among us will live to see India Free. It is enough that India shall be free and that we shall give our all to make her free…". While the army could not march to Delhi victorious, it had succeeded in its intent of arousing the sentiments of the Indians in India and more important, the Indian soldiers in the British Indian Army. These men met their own countrymen in the battle field but on opposite sides. Seeing the courage and the spirit of sacrifice of the INA men, the Indian soldiers had a change of heart. They, who so far had pledged their allegiance to the British, now rose up in revolt. When these two and a half million Indian soldiers revolted, the British Army was thrown out of gear. Netaji's giant suicide squad had done what it had set out for. While the INA had lost the war, they had won a moral victory. This revolt of the soldiers was followed by the RIN mutiny lead by courageous Punnu Khan. And then there was the public trial of the INA men at the Red Fort-an episode that spelled doom for the British. It was a disaster waiting to happen. The trial inflamed the passion of all Indians and the British realised, albeit late, that they had lost.

Netaji is truly one of the greatest leaders that India has ever produced. He was a man who was focused. India's freedom was uppermost in his mind and nothing, absolutely nothing could come in between him and his cause. Not even his failing health or the fear of death. His single minded devotion to the cause of India's liberation is truly a lesson for all of us to learn. He said, "…Let us all stand shoulder to shoulder and say with one heart and with one voice that our motto is, as Tennyson said through Ulysses, to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield." This became his credo. And it was this faith that he was able to instil into his men. He told them, "From today you are the soldiers of the Indian

national Army of Free India. You have volunteered to shoulder the responsibility of 40 crore of Indians. Form today your mind, might and money belongs to the Indian nation."He again said, "…Your names will be written in golden letters in the history if free India. Every soldier who is martyred in this holy war will have a monument in free India. The coming generations will shower flowers on those monuments. You are very fortunate that you have got this valuable opportunity to serve the mother land…" Well this was the way Netaji thought we Indians will remember those martyrs. But no, those brave soldiers who died fighting for the freedom of our motherland are today forgotten. Their sacrifices have been sidelined. It is tragic that even our leader Netaji has not been given his due place in the history. His life has been a chronicle of continuous endeavours and relentless toil.

He was truly an extraordinary may whose only burning desire was to shake off the shackles of colonial rule. This worthy man shed his blood, suffered immensely and died for our freedom, our prosperity and our well being. It is almost as if he said to his future children: here's my gift for you. But look at the condition that India is in today. In his address to an independence day meeting in Berlin on 26th January, 1943 he said, "… And India is a country where the past has not been forgotten, but where our past history and tradition live in our blood and the marrow of our bones. It is because of this national self-consciousness that neither political domination nor economic impoverishments have been able to kill our soul…" Such sterling words form this great man. He was one leader whose style of functioning was worth imitating, whose ideas worth adopting and whose examples worth following. But today we have buried our past. We have not made use of the wisdom of the past.

Netaji's skills as a diplomat left many of his contemporaries astounded. The manner in which he dealt with Hitler-even while requesting for help from Germany he minced no words in telling Hitler that he did not approve of his treatment of Jews-leaves one with no doubt of his courage and abilities as a diplomat. The Japanese Prime Minister Tojo was so enamoured by his engaging personality and sincerity that he granted him all his requests including the formation of the Provisional Government of Free India and handing over Andaman and Nicobar Islands to the

Government. He maintained complete autonomy in dealings with the leaders and equalled them in more ways than one. Much has been said and written about Netaji's conflict with Gandhiji. The conflict was only on ideology. Nonviolence was the lifelong creed of Gandhi but Netaji saw this as, a "temporary tactic, a tactic which is temporarily useful." It wasn't as if he didn't believe in the civil disobedience movement of Gandhi but as he said, "India will get freedom through an armed struggle coupled with a civil disobedience movement. But civil disobedience movement alone will not be enough …. As the British Government relies on the strength of bayonets, we too should use bayonets in order to defeat them decisively. As the enemy stands before us with the drawn sword, we should fight him only with the aid of the sword." The impossible is always absurd until it's done. Then it is possible. The British never for a moment believed that Indians had the strength to pick up arms and fight them but Netaji made this possible. And history is a witness to the truth that India got her independence only by revolutionary stand taken by Netaji and in the words of Lord Attlee, the role of Gandhi was "minimal". When Gandhi commended his non-cooperation programme to the Indian nation at the annual session of the Congress at Nagpur on 1920 he said, "If India had the sword today, she would have drawn the sword." So it was not as if Gandhi was opposed to the armed combat but was forced to believe that his country men lacked the capacity to militarily fight the enemy, and a much better equipped one at that. Hence Satyagraha was the only viable weapon he had at hand and one that proved to be highly successful in demonstrating to the British that Indians were capable of organizing themselves into a united front.

All said and done the respect that Netaji had for Gandhi was unquestionable. It was Netaji who gave him the title of Father of the Nation. He said, "…The service which Mahatma Gandhi had rendered to India and to the cause of India's freedom is so unique and unparalleled that his name will be written in letters of gold in our national history for all time." Well, the tragic and some times disturbing fact is that Netaji and his contribution to India's freedom has been relegated to the background. Today a child in school is being given a very distorted picture of history. I sincerely hope this situation is rectified soon for otherwise the damage

done will be dreadful. But sadly, we aren't even looking in this direction. Our minds are preoccupied with other issues.

How little it takes to make our lives unbearable…the broken top button of the shirt, a traffic jam, a tyre puncture, Indian team performing badly …. Everything slightly inconvenient makes us look up to the God and complain, crib, curse. We waste time in trivialities like the protest against the Miss World pageant which was appalling to say the least. We seem to ignore larger issues that are facing us in the eye. Issues like bride burning, child marriages, sati, female infanticide which have debauched our society. Issues like corruption are staggering. But what is even more shocking is out total indifference to the situation. For long we have been swallowing our anger with our pride that we have begun to get used to its taste. Injustice is to us, second nature. We thrive on it and let others thrive on it.

Post independent India has been through some really rough weather. Today our hard-earned freedom for which countless men and women laid down their lives is being threatened by various foes. Why have we not been able to learn form the experiences of our past leaders, sages, thinkers and scholars? Our forefathers showed us that courage and sacrifice can triumph against overwhelming odds. Netaji said, "… I would like to remind you that a revolutionary is one who believes in the justice of a cause, and who believes that the cause is bound to prevail in the long run. He who gets depressed over failures is no revolutionary. The motto for a revolutionary is: Hope for the best, but be prepared for the worst…Hope is a quality we share with the spider. He makes us feel positive. Hope makes us forget failures. Hope brings hope. But for a leader, hope takes much more. It takes more than just waiting to make hope arrive on the horizon. He has to pledge his life. Netaji was hopeful. Still believing that his tomorrow can be bright. If the spider wouldn't give up, why should we? The spirit of our past leaders knew no fatigue or death and by their abiding faith in India and their mission, they had shaped the destiny of future India. The optimist that he was, he said, "…And if we fail in that too (attaining independence) then there will indeed be World War III to give us another opportunity to strike for our freedom." Let us drive inspiration form the pages of his

life. Fortunately for posterity, he was also a prolific writer and his own letters have survived. For a whole section of Indians then, Netaji was a lighthouse of hope. Fifty years of Independence and we have done all that we could to extinguish that flicker of hope. We have allowed his sufferings and those countless soldiers to be diluted. Where are all those men who should have been worthy successors of our priceless heritage? Where all those modern crusaders who were are suppose to finish the task left behind by our forefathers? They paid the price for the kind of mission they had embarked upon. After all nothing can be got free, a price has to be paid for everything. With our any expectation of a miracle, this country must do all it can to see that the current scenario is corrected. Society is full of issues to fight and the least we can expect from our leaders is concrete evidence that these issues are being talked. Let our youth take charge for this is their country and they are its future.

We are not mere syncopates. We believed in Netaji. We identified with his mission. We shared his dreams. We were his partners in his fight for liberation who contributed our bit, suffered and sacrificed for our country. To the youth I seek their attention. For on their shoulders rest the future of India. Netaji taught us to stand up and be counted for values that count-discipline, sacrifice, patriotism and good old hard work. Fifty years after independence and these fundamental values still count. His efforts are testimonials of his determination to succeed, come what may. … He spread his wings and gave his country the opportunity to test untried waters. The results did not matter. The fact that the chance did. He made the world envious of him, envious of India and her achievements. Truly, only Netaji could have done that! Let our youth take over form where Netaji had left. We are hopefully moving into the 21st century. The young must wake up to that. And with the confidence of a winner say, *Hum honge kamayab*.

SYMBOL OF NATIONAL INTEGRATION

India is more than a country. It is a continent comprising of people who speak different languages, look different and dress differently. It is a country where religion has a very strong base and where followers of perhaps all known religions live and

practice their faith in their respective manner. India has not only almost 850 million people but also has a great diversity of culture. For example, let us take a person from Ladak or the Kashmir Valley in the north and compare him with someone in Kanyakumari in the South or, for that matter, with someone in Rajasthan or Gujarat in the West or Nagaland and Manipur in the East. What have they in common? They do not look alike for their climatic conditions are very different. In fact they can not even converse with one another because they speak completely different languages. Yet each is an Indian. Often they quarrel among themselves, but in time of crisis or danger, they become one. There is some thing which holds them together. It is a fine line but the bond is very strong. It is difficult to find words to describe this. I call it Indianness or being an Indian-the pride of belonging to India, the land which has given them birth and where they shall return ultimately after death or where they shall return ultimately after death or where the ashes of their mortal remains will mingle and become one with the waters of the rivers which flow through the country's length and breadth.

In order to keep this vast and varied multitude of people together, the country needs a leader of the caliber of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. He believed passionately that all Indians, irrespective of the region they come from or language they spoke or religious faith they practiced, were members of the same family. He gave his belief practical shape and convinced all those who came in contact with him that unless this basic fact was accepted without hesitation, there was no future for India. Netaji as Subhash Babu in his early days was a symbol of the restlessness of Indian youth, who dreamed of a great and free India. As Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, he was the colossus who strode across East Asia and organized and led an army of liberation against the British Empire, entrenched in India for almost 200 years. In the two years when he led the Indian independence movement, he lived a dream-a dream that the dedicated and the restless youths of India had dreamt for decades and for daring to make that dream into a reality, several had gone to gallows with a smile on their faces.

I came in contact with this great man and, in the opinion of many of us, the greatest Indian leader of his time, when I was only

23, a very impressionable age. Netaji opened our eyes, so to say. He made us see Indian through the eyes of an Indian. His call was "Give me blood and I promise you freedom". Indians all over South-East Asia and Burma flocked to him in their thousands, offering all their worldly possessions and their own lives in the service of the nation. He had the knack of getting the best of every person. There was absolutely no distinction about which part of the country he or she came from, or which religious faith he or she followed or which language he or she spoke. It was pleasure and privilege to be an Indian at that time. Many, and I repeat many, of us wanted to become martyrs in the service of our country for a martyr never dies; he becomes immoral and lives forever in the hearts, memory and the history of his country.

Let me now conclude by giving the Azad Hind Government national Anthem. Here the spirit of every freedom fighter of the INA is completely and adequately expressed.

National Anthem

Subh Sukh Chain ki barkha barse; Bharat bhag hai jaga Punjab, Sind, Gujrat, Maratha, Dravid, Utkal, Banga Chanchal Sagar Vindh Himala; Nila Jamuna Ganga Tere nit gun gayen; tujh se jiwan paen; Sab tan paye asha. Suraj ban kar jag par chamke, Bharat nam subhaga Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya ho, Sab ke dil men prit basae; teri mithi bani Har sub eke rahne wale; har mazhab ke prani Sab bhed aur farak mita ke; sab god me teri ake, Goondhe prem ki mala Suraj ban kar jag par chamke, Bharat nam subhaga Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya ho, Bharat naam Subhaga Subh savere pankh pakharu; tere hi gun gayen Bas bhari bharpur hawaen; jiwan men rut layen Sab mil kar Hind pukaren; Jai Azad Hind ke nare Piara desh hamara Suraj ban kar jag par chamke, Bharat nam subhaga Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya ho, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya, Jaya ho, Bharat naam Subhaga.

Jai Hind.

BOSE AND NATIONAL INTEGRATION

Netaji uttered a note of caution to his army that the partition of the country would solve no old or outstanding problem, but would give rise to fresh ones instead. He could bear out through his INA experiment that despite disparities in religion, language

and ethnicity, there was some thing of an underlying unity in the midst of diversity in our people. Bound by a common goal. A common subjectivity and action programme as it was, the INA could live down at the operational level, all manner of differences of religion, language, caste and the rest of it. Throughout his political career Bose crusaded for unity in action and unity of faith. He never agreed to a unity of sorts for the sheer purpose of temporizing, rather he did encourage a genuine respect for all the religions and communities in his INA. He made sure that religion was treated purely a personal affair. A common greeting, a common but simple lingua franca and a National Anthem were all devised to work as cementing forces in the conduct of the INA affairs. Not only were the INA soldiers united in their implicit allegiance to their leader and government but also they were deeply animated by a spirit of national integration. Incidentally Bose himself was a religious man in personal life, there was no place for any communal or sectarian consideration in his political ideology.

He never shied away, throughout his political life, form and insistence on complete separation of religion from the nationalist politics of the day. His ideas in regard to communal harmony found an almost complete expression and in perfect implementation in the INA. He saw to it that INA was rendered free from all political influences which the British Raj encouraged to maintain in India as a dependency. His spirit of secularism moved and gripped the INA as a whole, much though every soldier in it had perfect liberty to practice his own religion privately. The lesson was brought home to them by Bose, that the communal divide was just a sample of British propaganda.

Nataji was quite alive to the problem of national unity since the inception of his rather short but eventful political career. His approach to this problem was both incisive and positive. He always endeavoured to persuade the Muslims of India to join the main stream of the struggle for the emancipation of India. The Pakistan idea was never his cup of tea. Indeed through his INA and Azad Hind Government, Netaji showed us at a critical moment of our history how to forge national will in a concrete, resolute action. He fervently tried to give rise to a cultural organization

in South East Asia, through which the various races and religions would be enabled to converge our Indian foundation. In his first platoon lecture to the Fauz entitled "Unity of India, past and present", he dealt with the insidious British propaganda to the world regarding our so-called manifold differences.

As early as August 1942, he raised the issue of national integration in India in the columns of a German paper. He also arranged for a committee to be set upon our national integration when the Andaman and the Nicobr Islands were occupied by the INA Government. The speech he delivered on the same subject at the Chettiar temple is one to reckon with. He facilitated the entry of men of other religions as well in the temple in the face of vehement resistance from the keepers of the temple. More than that, the pledge the INA soldiers had to sign the highlights the commitment of the army to the ideals of unity, secularism and democracy.

For the growth of a genuine national spirit in the Army, Bose waged a relentless struggle against the splitters and opportunists both in the country and outside. He made the remarkable prophecy that India freed form the British was destined to develop a strong nation. In his opinion only a truly national government could implement a meaningful programme of unity of our people and only a genuine patriotic army could bring about our unity at the barricades. He claimed he could bring about a measure of communal unity in his ranks simply because the Britishers were not there. Apart form this he initiated a scheme of secular and scientific education through his government and started a sustained propaganda on its behalf to fight out all divisive forces. He felt that India must reject the Wavell plan which really meant parcel our country, a similar plan the British tried in Ireland and Palestine too. The prime item on his agenda was the removal or religious intolerance and fanaticism through intensive and ceaseless propaganda. In his famous Tokyo speech of 1944, he touched upon India's basic unity, a model which could be served to the people with in India through his INA.

For one thing the INA proved to be a living example of national unity and Gandhi was all praise for the way in which Bose infused the spirit of unity amongst his men. In fact the INA

trial virtually shook the unfree and undivided Indians form their long deep slumber. Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians were evenly represented in the Government and the Army and they all unitedly posed from outside a serious challenge to the separatist forces set work in the homeland. The Indian National Army became a dramatic symbol of national unity as the trials of a Hindu, a Sikh and a Muslim INA officers proved to the hilt. A Muslim accompanied Bose in his perilous submarine journey and another Muslim sent him off for the last time at the airport. Some of his brigades were led by Muslim officers exclusively and some were named after the living Indian nationalists leaders. The INA trials followed up by the RIN revolt represented a turning of the tide as far as the prospects of the secularism were concerned.

Netaji Subhash assembled different scattered forces in East Asia and formed an army with the help of youths of different areas and communities in India. He mobalised the a-political forces in South East Asia in order to fight the last war of liberation for a United India. Indeed he and his INA served to hold up the dropping spirits of all sections of Indian people and example of rare unity and patriotism. He infused into his men a certain non-communal spirit, and inspired them to feel proud of their Indian identity. He inspired his men, in his own inimitable way to identify themselves not as Hindus or Muslims but as the sons and daughters of India. He succeeded in installing in them a kind of cultured sensitivity and a secular passion. He succeeded in rousing a mighty army unified in spirit and committed ideologically to work for a free and united India. He almost fully carried out his ideas on national unity in the formation of the INA which consisted of more than sixty percent of Muslims. He could persuade his associates to shed their religious superstitions about food and the practice of denominational faith. He forge an emotional relationship among the diverse ethnicities that came to serve in his army on their own accord. In fact the INA became a paradigm of national and emotional integration. However, it is not enough to recapitulate the INA saga but it is peremptory to take lessons form it, now more than ever, particularly when we have to tackle the problem of disintegration that threatens us today, when the whole nation is faced with a crisis of leadership of conviction and general sense of direction.

TRANSPARENCY

What reminds me of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose the most are those words which he spoke to us on various occasions, when we had the good luck to wage a regular war for the Independence of India under his command from 1943 to 1945. Apart from the clarity of his vision, spontaneity of speech, serenity and uniformity of thought, with which he explained with perfect ease various problems of our struggle and his plans, was the expression on his face which served as a window through which we could see where he was leading us to. So transparent were his dealings with us! A communication with him always left us more enlightened and responsible. It gave us confidence in the righteousness of our cause, in his ability to lead us and our nation to victory and freedom. We gained so much self-confidence that we felt that the very destiny was in our hands.

"Let me show a sample of his oration when he addressed us, the soldiers of the Indian National Army, for the first time after receiving our parade at Singapore on July the 5th 1943. His concluding words were : "I have said that today is the proudest day of my life. For an enslaved people, there can be no greater pride, no higher honour, than to be the first soldier in the Army of Liberation. But this honour carries with it a corresponding responsibility and I am deeply conscious of it. I assure you that I shall be with you in darkness and in sunshine, in sorrow and in joy, in suffering and in victory. For the present, I can offer you nothing except hunger, thirst, privation, forced marches and death. But if you follow me in life and in death, as I am confident you will, I shall lead you to victory and freedom. It does not matter who among us will live to see India free. It is enough that India shall be free and that we shall give our all to make her free. May God bless our Army and grant us victory in the coming fight.

Inquilab Zindabad!

Azad Hind Zindabad!"

Above words coming strait from the heart of the man of the splendours of Netaji Subhash went straight into our hearts. Those words left us honoured and proud of being in the INA. We felt we were important and responsible beings. Netaji's achievements and sacrifices were already so great that no further decoration

could enhance his majesty. On the contrary his being first amongst us was much needed recognition for us. He placed his confidence in us. Confidence is a great morale booster. It invigorated our spirits. Our chests expanded, with heads held high and feet dug deep into ground with the battle cry-CHALO Delhi on our lips, we followed the fluttering TRICOLOUR. And we sang :

Kadam kadam Bharaey ja

Khushi Ke geet gaye ja

Ye Zindegi hai Qaum ki

Tu Waum par lutaey ja.

Within a few days of his arrival in the East, Netaji gave us Vanguard-the Rani Jhansi Regiment. We felt that the valour of the Goddess Durga had reincarnated in the daughters of Mother India. They manifested the blessings of the Goddess and power of her Shakti. With our allies the Japanese our armies advanced against the armies of Great Britain and their allies who were in occupation of the Indian Subcontinent. Some of the bloodiest battles of the Second World War were fought in the spring of 1944 on the battle fields of Akyab, Arakan, Manipur, Imphal, Nagaland, Kohima and Red Hill. India's Tricolour was planted on the liberated territory of India at Moirang in Manipur.

Victory was a matter of touch and go. Then came rains. Our supply lines were cut off. Tables turned. Having lost one hundred thousand lives, we and our valiant allies the Japanese withdrew to the Irrawaddy line. Initiative passed on to opponent's hands. Delhi started getting out of our reach. The Allies were winning everywhere. We had practically lost the War. When Netaji was asked, "Now what is left for us to fight for?" his prompt reply was, "To pay the price of India's Liberty." We continued our fight on the banks of the Irrawaddy at Nyaungu and Bagan, Mount Popa and Kyauk padaung, Magwe and so on, towards Prome and Pegu on the way to Rangoon. We fought against odds. What to talk about weapons and rations, even water was scarce.

So what? Wasn't it one of the things offered to us by Netaji during his very first address on 5th July.1943. His oft-repeated words, "There is no power on earth which can keep India enslaved any longer. India shall be free and before long." His prophetic

words sustained our spirits. His appreciations of our actions on the battle fields kept up our morale. The fight was kept on.

Eventually we did reach Delhi-our destination-not as free persons but as prisoners. We were vanquished and the British were the victor. Dungeons of the Red Fort were our abode. Our trial was held from 5th November to 31st December 1945. The autumn of that year was one of the gloomiest the Indian nation ever had. The people did not light their homes on Diwali-The Festival of lights. The charge against us was of waging war against the King and of murder and abetment of murder. The trial was held in the dormitory of a British Barrack on the Red Fort of Delhi. According to the law death appeared to be the just punishment for us. The British Government were determined to set an example, so as to teach the Indian soldier a lesson never to dare to take up arms against the King. They had not won the World War to liquidate the British Empire. But for us it was the last chance to pay the price of India's liberty. During the War the British had succeeded in keeping the INA actions and even the name of the Indian National Army a well guarded secret. They could not keep that secret anymore. Soldiers coming home after the War had gone through a complete psychological revolution when the brother did shed brother's blood on either side in the battle-field on lands abroad. The Indian soldier had seen the INA fight against the British guns with rifles, and tanks with bullock carts and the aircrafts with empty stomachs in tattered uniforms. As if that was not enough, the British victorious officers and men in towns of Singapore, Malaya, Thailand and Burma, were greeted with "JAI HIND" by boys and girls of Balak Sena. Greetings of "JAI HIND" meaning "Victory to India" made soldiers of Indian Army pause and ponder as to what did they fight for?

For their bread or for the British? Thus when we, the soldiers of the INA., were prisoners behind the gates of carious jails and detention camps tiny tots of Netaji's Balak Sena were still in the field shouting JAI HIND. The British had no weapon which could be used against the Balak Sena. Under those circumstances the British Government's decision to put on trial three INA officers-a Muslim, a Hindu and a Sikh, was a blunder. The Indian public were yet in the dark about us and our actions. Actions which were noble, nationalist, according to civilized rules of International

war, and for the liberation of our motherland. The British were determined to teach us a lesson and we were determined with unity and faith to sacrifice our life to pay the price for India's liberty. In a situation like that no enemy could ever favour her archenemies by providing such a grand (nor a better) stage than the historic Red Fort of Delhi. We were further favoured by our own people who united as a man to defend us during the trial.

Tallest of the tall legal luminaries of India got together with Shri Bhulabhai Desai as their chief Counsel to defend the accused officers of the INA. In his historic address Mr. Desai explained, that it was the right of a subject race to wage war for their liberty. Desai's address awakened the whole nation. How apply the British Commander in chief in India, General Sir Claud Auchinleck, who had spent all his life in the Indian Army and known the soldiers' mind well, did assess the situation then prevailing is apparent through his letter to Army Commanders dated 12th February, 1946. The letter is marked STRICTLY PERSONAL AND SECRET: NOT TO BE PASSED THROUGH ANY OFFICE.

It is a long letter in which Sir Auchinleck laboured hard to explain to his Army Commanders the effect of the action taken in respect of the first INA trial on the Indian Army as a whole. I quote just an excerpt form his letter. It is most important that we should study and analyse carefully these effects, as they may influence very greatly our ability, to maintain the solidarity and reliability of the Indian Army in the difficult times which undoubtedly lie ahead of us. It is for this reason that I am writing this letter to you. I have considered the desirability of making a personal public statement in explanation of my action in commuting the sentences of transportation passed by the Court on the first three accused, but I have decided that this would not be in the best of interest of discipline of the maintenance of my influence and authority as Commander-in-Chief. I feel however, that we should do all we can to remove the feelings of doubt, resentment and even disgust which appear to exist in the minds of quite a number of British Officers, who have not the knowledge or the imagination to be able to view the situation as a whole, or to understand present state of feeling in India. As I see it, the communication of the sentences of transportation on Shah Nawaz, Dhillon and Sehgal has had the following effects in India:

(a) On the general public, moderate as well as extremist, Muslim as well Hindu. Pleasure and intense relief born of the conviction that confirmation of the Sentences would have resulted in violent internal effect.

(b) This feeling does not, in my opinion, spring universally from the idea that the convicted officers were trying to rid India of the British and therefore, to be applauded, whatever crimes they might commit, but from a generally genuine feeling that they were patriots and nationalists and that, therefore, even if they were misled they should be treated with clemency, as true sons of India. In this connection, it should be remembered, I think, that every Indian worthy of the name today a "Nationalist", though this does not mean that he is necessarily "anti-British." All the same, where India and her independence is concerned, there are no "Pro-British Indians."

Netaji's contributions in the making of India are unique. What to talk of INA, Netaji inspired not only the Indians as a whole, but also the nationals of those countries who where still not independent. The actions of the Royal Indian Navy and certain personnel of all the three Military Services at Bombay, Karachi and other places in the name of Netaji were like the last straw which broke the back of the mighty British Colonial Empire on whom the Sun never used to set. According to Netaji's oft-repeated words, "India shall be free and before long", we did attain freedom of which we are celebrating the Golden Jubilee today along with Netaji along with Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose's Birthday when he completes a century and enters the new one. I wish Netaji was here today to see us free. He was the only leader who could keep India united. But when the partition of the subcontinent is an established fact, let us wish all the offsprings of Hindustan, Bangladesh and Pakistan, happiness, peace, plenty and glory.

PROCLAMATION OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF AZAD HIND

After their first defeat at the hands of the British in 1757 in Bengal, the Indian people fought an uninterrupted series of hard and bitter battles over a stretch of one hundred years. The history of this period teems with examples of unparalleled heroism and

self-sacrifice. And, in the pages of that history, the names of Sirajuddaula and Mohanlal of Bengal, Haider Ali, Tippu Sultan and Velu Tampi of South India, Appa Sahib Bhonsle and Peshwa Baji Rao of Maharashtra, the Begums of Oudh, Sardar Shyam Singh Atariwala of Punjab and last, but not the least, Rani Laxmibai of Jhansi, Tantia Tope, Maharaja Kunwar Singh of Dumraon and Nana Sahib-among others-the names of all these warriors are for ever engraved in letters of gold. Unfortunately for us, our forefathers did not at first realize that the British constituted a grave threat to the whole of India, and they did not therefore put up a united front against the enemy.

Ultimately, when the Indian people were roused to the reality of the situation, they made a concerted move and under the flag of Bahadur Shah in 1857, they fought there last war as free men. In spite of a series of brilliant victories in the early stages of this war, ill-luck and faulty leadership gradually brought about their final collapse and subjugation. Nevertheless, such heroes as the Rani of Jhansi, Tantia Tope, Kunwar Singh and Nana Sahib live like eternal stars in the nation's memory to inspire us to greater deeds of sacrifice and valour. Forcibly disarmed by the British after 1857 and subjected to terror and brutality, the Indian people lay prostrate for a while-but with the rebirth of the Indian National Congress in 1885, there came a new awakening.

From 1885, until the end of the last World War, the Indian people in their endeavour to recover their lost liberty, tried all possible methods-namely agitation and propaganda, boycott of British goods, terrorism and sabotage-and finally armed revolution. But all these efforts failed for a time. Ultimately in 1920, when the Indian people haunted by a sense of failure, were groping for a new method, Mahatma Gandhi came forward with the new weapon of non-cooperation and civil disobedience. For two decades thereafter, the Indian people went through a phase of intense patriotic activity. The message of freedom was carried to every Indian home. Through personal example, people were taught to suffer, to sacrifice and to die in the cause of freedom. From the centre of the remotest villages, the people were knit together into one political organization. Thus the Indian people not only recovered their political consciousness but became a political entity

once again. They could now speak with one voice and strive with one will for one common goal. From 1937 to 1939, through the work of the Congress Ministers in eight provinces, they gave proof of the readiness and their capacity to administer their own affairs. Thus, on the eve of the present World War, the stage was set for the final struggle for India's liberation. During the course of this war, Germany with the help of her allies has dealt shattering blows to our enemy in Europe-while Nippon, with the help of her allies, has inflicted a knockout blow to our enemy in East Asia. Favoured by a most happy combination of circumstances, the Indian people today have a wonderful opportunity for achieving their national emancipation. For the first time in recent history, Indians abroad have also been politically roused and united in one organization. They are not only thinking and feeling in tune with their countrymen at home, but are also marching in step with them along the path to freedom. In East Asia, in particular, over two million Indians are now organized as one solid phalanx, inspired by the slogan of 'Total Mobilisation'. And in front of them stand the salaried ranks of India's Army of Liberation, with the slogan 'Onward to Delhi', on their lips.

Having goaded Indians to desperation by its hypocrisy and having driven them to starvation and death by plunder and loot, British rule in India has forfeited the goodwill of the Indian people altogether and is now living a precarious existence. It needs but a flame to destroy the last vestige of that happy rule. To light that flame is the task of India's Army of Liberation. Assured of enthusiastic support of the civil population at home and also of large sections of Britain's Indian Army, and backed by gallant and invincible allies abroad-but relying in the first instance on its own strength, India's Army of Liberation is confident of fulfilling its historic role. Now that the dawn of freedom is at hand, it is the duty of the Indian people to set up a provisional Government of their own and launch the last struggle under the banner of the Government. But with all the Indian Leaders in prison and the people at home totally disarmed, it is not possible to set up a Provisional Government.

It is therefore the duty of the Indian Independence League in East Asia, supported by all patriotic Indians at home and abroad,

to undertake this task-the task of setting up a Provisional Government of Azad Hind (Free India) and of conducting the last fight for freedom, with the help of the Army of Liberation, (that is, the Azad Hind Fauj or the Indian National Army) organized by the League. Having been constituted as the Provisional Government of Azad Hind by the Indian Independence League in East Asia, we enter upon our duties with full sense of responsibility that has devolved on us. We pray that the province may bless our work and struggle for the emancipation of our Motherland. And we hereby pledge our lives for our comrades in arms to the cause of her freedom, of her welfare and her exaltation among the nations of the world.

It will be the task of the Provisional Government to launch and to conduct the struggle that will bring about the expulsion of the British and their allies from the soil of India. It will then be the task of the Provisional Government to bring about the establishment of a permanent National Government of Azad Hind constituted in accordance with the will of the Indian people and enjoying their confidence. After the British and their allies are overthrown and until a permanent National Government of Azad Hind is set up on Indian soil, the Provisional Government will administer the affairs of the country in trust for the Indian people.

The provisional Government is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Indian. It guarantees religious liberty, as well as equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens. It declares its firm resolves to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally and transcending all the differences cunningly fostered by an alien government in the past.

In the name of God, in the name of bygone generations who have welded the Indian people into one nation, and in the dead heroes who have bequeathed to us a tradition of heroism and self-sacrifice-we call upon the Indian people to rally round our banner and strike for India's freedom. We call upon them to launch the final struggle (against the British and all their allies in India and prosecute that struggle) with valour and perseverance in full faith in final victory-until the enemy is expelled from Indian soil and the Indian people are once again a free nation.

5

Political Views of Netaji

Subhash Chandra Bose advocated complete freedom for India at the earliest, whereas most of the Congress Committee wanted it in phases, through a Dominion status. Even though Bose and Gandhi had differing ideologies, the latter called Bose the *"Prince among the Patriots"* in 1942.

Bose admired Gandhi, recognising his importance as a symbol of Indian Nationalism; he called him "The Father of Our Nation" in a radio broadcast from Rangoon in 1944, in which he stated that "I am convinced that if we do desire freedom we must be prepared to wade through blood", a statement somewhat at odds with Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence. Thus, although they shared the goal of an Independent India, by 1939 the two had become divided over the strategy which should be used to achieve Indian Independence, and to some degree the form which the post-Independence state should take: Gandhi was hostile to industrialisation, whilst Bose saw it as the only route to making India strong and self-sufficient (in this he may have been influenced, like many other Indian intellectuals of the time, by reports of the success of the Soviet five-year plans). Nehru disagreed with Gandhi on this point as well, though not over the tactics of protest. At the time the Second World War began, great divisions existed in the Indian independence movement about whether to exploit the weakness of the British to achieve independence. Some felt that any distinctions between the political allegiances and ideologies of the warring factions of Europe were inconsequential in the face of the possibility of Indian independence, given the fact that the British themselves showed

so little respect for democracy or democratic reforms in India. Others felt that it was inappropriate to seek concessions when Britain itself was in peril, or else that pressure was better applied within India and in peaceful fashion, and found that their distaste for Nazi Germany and Japan outweighed any possibility that an alliance with them would bring India's independence closer.

Bose, in particular, was accused of 'collaborating' with the Axis, after he fled to Germany in 1941 and offered Hitler an alliance. He criticized the British during World War II, saying that while Britain was allegedly fighting for the freedom of the European nations under Nazi control, it would not grant independence to its own colonies, including India. It may be observed that along with Nehru, Bose had organized and led protest marches against the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, and of China itself in 1938, when he was Congress president. In 1937 he published an article attacking Japanese Imperialism in the Far East, although he betrayed some admiration for other aspects of the Japanese regime. Bose's earlier correspondence (prior to 1939) also reflects his deep disapproval of the racist practices of, and annulment of democratic institutions in Nazi Germany. He also, however, expressed admiration for the authoritarian methods (though not the racial ideologies) which he saw in Italy and Germany during the 1930s, and thought they could be used in building an independent India. Nevertheless, Bose's tenure as Congress Party President (1938-39) did not reflect any particular anti-democratic or authoritarian attributes. Nirad C. Chaudhuri, Anton Pelinka and Leonard Gordon have remarked that Bose's skills were best illustrated at the negotiating table, rather than on the battlefield.

That Bose eventually changed his political stance reflects his deep discontent with the nature of the British rule, and a growing belief that the formation of an Indian free state was too far into the future on the British political roadmap to be acceptable. At the Tripura Congress session of 1939, he made his views quite explicit-he demanded for a programme of immediately giving the British Government a six-months ultimatum to grant the national demand of independence and of launching a mass civil disobedience movement if it failed to do so. He believed that "... the country was internally more ripe for a revolution than ever

before and that the coming international crisis would give India an opportunity for achieving her emancipation, which is rare in human history.". Bose's judgment in allying with the Japanese has been questioned, as many argue that he would have been unable to ensure an independent India had he ridden to power on Japanese bayonets, and was in danger of being turned into a puppet ruler like Pu-yi, the last Chinese Emperor in Manchukuo. In 1943 Rash Behari Bose had urged this on him during his last visit to Subhash Bose in Singapore, pointing out that the Japanese had claimed right of conquest in Manchuria and would do so in India, whilst Quit India had shown that this would not be accepted by the Indian Nation. Nevertheless, given the INA's overwhelming dependence on Japanese military support, he would have been in a very weak position. Bose also seems to have ignored the appalling treatment meted out by the Japanese to the Asian inhabitants of the lands they conquered as part of the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity sphere, which included the forcible recruitment of labour from the overseas Indian population to build projects such as the Burma Railway, and massacres of Malayan Chinese in Singapore where he spent most of the War.

Bose has been branded as a fascist in some quarters. Others believe that Bose had clearly expressed his belief that democracy was the best option for India. The pro-Bose thinkers believe that his authoritarian control of the Indian National Army was based on political pragmatism and a post-colonial recovery doctrine rather than any anti-democratic belief.. However, during the war (and possibly as early as the 1930s) Bose seems to have decided that no democratic system could be adequate to overcome India's poverty and social inequalities, and he wrote that an authoritarian state, similar to that of Soviet Russia (which he had also seen and admired) would be needed for the process of national rebuilding. Accordingly some suggest that Bose's alliance with the Axis during the war was based on more than just pragmatism, and that Bose may have been a Fascist, though not a Nazi; alternatively, others consider he might have been using populist methods of mobilization common to many postcolonial leaders.

Had either of the alliances he forged during the war resulted in Indian independence in the manner he envisaged, it would

have been at the cost of an Allied defeat in the Second World War, a price that some Indians would argue is too high: Gandhi himself, in the immediate aftermath of the war, said that Bose had been "foolish in imagining, that by allying himself with the Japanese and the Germans, who were not only aggressive Powers, but also dangerous Powers, he could get Indian freedom". The alternative of nonviolent protest within India espoused by Gandhi and the rest of Congress ultimately led to British withdrawal, albeit at the expense of the partition of the country along communal lines. Even before 1939, Congress had secured political concessions from the British in the form of elected Provincial Assemblies, and an agreement that the British taxpayer would foot the bill for Indian re-armament. Although it was rejected by Congress at the time, the 1942 Cripps mission's offer of full independence after the war could be considered the point at which the British departure became inevitable. Britain's weakness after the war, and domestic political pressure on the Labour Government also made British withdrawal more likely. Publicly at least, Bose never believed that this would happen unless they were driven out by force: as late as 1944, three years prior to Independence, he announced that "I am honestly convinced that the British Government will never recognise India's demand for independence"..

Nirad Chaudhuri considered it a backhanded tribute to Bose that the Congress tricolor and the Muslim League green flag flew together for the last time during the mutiny of the Indian navy in Bombay unleashed in 1946 partly at anger within the Navy at the trial of INA officers by the British.

Judith Brown argues that the Mutiny of the Indian Navy was a minor factor in the British decision to leave compared to domestic political pressure, American hostility to any continuation of the *Raj*, and the breakdown of almost all networks of support and collaboration brought about by thirty years of Congress agitation. By 1946 over 50% of the members of the Indian Civil Service were Indians, and even Churchill recognised that the offer of independence made by the Cripps Mission in 1942 could not now be withdrawn. In this interpretation concerns over the loyalty of the military were only one factor amongst many amidst the general breakdown in authority: nor, it could be argued, did all this

necessarily stem from the activities of Bose and the INA. The prospect of communalism infecting the armed forces worried the British just as much.

There is no doubt that Bose was considered a great patriot, and was considered as such even by his rivals in the Congress. Gandhi himself wrote that Bose's "... patriotism is second to none", and he was moved to proclaim after Bose's disappearance that he was a "prince among patriots"-a reference, in particular, to Bose's achievement in integrating women and men from all the regions and religions of India in the Indian National Army. Bose wanted freedom for India at the earliest opportunity, and to some extent, he didn't care who he had to approach for assistance. It is thus quite understandable that he remains a controversial figure to this day.

MODERN POPULAR VIEWS

The INA is fondly remembered by some Japanese rightwingers, who see the Japanese efforts to support Bose as proof of their view that Japan really was fighting on behalf of the oppressed peoples of Asia. In addition, the INA is seen by some as an organisation devoid of the divisive energies of parochialism that have since plagued Indian politics. Bose's portrait hangs in the Indian Parliament, and a statue has been erected in front of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly.

Bose was posthumously awarded the Bharat Ratna, India's highest civilian award in 1992, but it was later withdrawn in response to a Supreme Court directive following a Public Interest Litigation filed in the Court against the "posthumous" nature of the award. The Award Committee could not give conclusive evidence of Bose's death and thus it invalidated the "posthumous" award. Kolkata's civil airport and a university have been named after him. In the period between the two world wars, Gandhi was the most powerful force within the Congress, and, it's probably fair to say, in nationalist politics. By this I mean not only that Gandhi was able to make the big decisions, or at least influence those decisions, but also that Gandhian methods had become the primary tactics of the nationalist movement. These tactics involved an emphasis on nonviolence, and a vacillation between non-

cooperation and active participation. In other wards, the Gandhi and the Congress would go for years quietly coexisting with British rule, then launch a non-cooperation campaign, gain some concessions from the British, and then go back to another period of relative quiet. For the most part, there were few challenges to this approach outside the Congress. The terrorists carried on in certain areas of the country, especially Bengal, but they were, at the most, a nuisance. By the time of WW II, it had long become evident that elite terrorism was not going to inspire a popular revolution. After Gandhi came along and demonstrated how a popular movement might be generated, the terrorists became even less relevant.

The challenge to the predominance of Gandhi and Gandhian tactics in Indian nationalism came from within the Congress. It came from a man named Subhash Chandra Bose, who, at the height of his political influence, was one of the two or three most powerful leaders in the Congress. Gandhi certainly saw Bose as a rival and a dangerous upstart, and did his best to destroy him politically. I want to focus on Bose today not because I think his battles with Gandhi are particularly fascinating, but because Bose held up an alternative vision, not only of political tactics, but also of political objectives. Whereas Gandhi sought compromises with the British, Bose sought absolute victories. Gandhi was willing to wait a long time for independence, Bose wanted immediate action, if not immediate results. Gandhi was anti-materialistic and hostile to modern technology, Bose saw technology and mass production as essential to survival and dignity. Gandhi wanted a decentralized society and disliked the modern state; Bose wanted a strong central government and saw the modern state as the only solution to India's problems. And finally, Bose did not share Gandhi's dedication to nonviolence.

Bose came from a upper-class Bengali family. His father was a well-known lawyer in Cuttack. He was the ninth child in a big, busy family; but his parents were aloof, and Bose grew up as a loner. He was a voracious reader, and he was especially attracted to the writings of the 19th~century Hindu social reformer, Swami Vivekananda. From Vivekananda he picked up a desire to take India, especially Hindu India, back to an idealized past in which

Indians had been strong, moral and free. As he grew older, and became interested in socialism, he lost this interest in mythical golden ages and his overtly Hindu outlook. But he kept his determination to do something about what he saw as social injustice towards low-caste groups, the poor, and women.

He was a brilliant student, and became active in student politics at Calcutta's Presidency College. In those wartime years, the university offered military training to students who were interested (sort of like the ROTC today), and Bose eagerly signed up. But unlike Gandhi, who also had military experience, Bose did not join because he saw it as his duty to the Empire. He joined because he believed military training was an important part of a nationalist's education. He fervently believed that India, and especially Hindus, had become politically subjugated because of their military weakness. If the nation was to be free and worthy of respect, Bose felt, its citizens must know how to fight.

Also at Presidency College, he had one of his first direct encounters with the British. He became involved in an assault by students on a British professor, and was kicked out of school. This incident has since become one of the major myths of Indian nationalism, with Bose presented as the hero and Edward Oaten, the professor, presented as a racist villain. The truth is probably not so clear-cut. What is more likely is that Oaten was tactless, and Bose was hot-headed. A sense of humour was not one of Bose's strong points; he tended to be touchy and took everything very seriously. He eventually graduated from Scottish Church college in Calcutta (after his father pulled a few strings to get him admitted), and was then packed off to England by his family to prepare for the ICS (Indian Civil Service) exams. He arrived in England in 1919, when he was 23 years old.

It's interesting to compare Bose's English experience with Gandhi's. Bose was probably a bit less socially isolated than Gandhi had been when he had first arrived; there were more Indians around for him to spend time with. As with Gandhi, the time Bose spent in England made a deep impression on his thinking. Like Gandhi, Bose became something of a dandy in England, always wearing expensive, perfectly pressed clothes. Like Gandhi, Bose was terrified of sex, and put all his guards up when he was around

English women. And like Gandhi, Bose became more conscious of his Indian identity when he was in England. But there were some very significant differences, as well. Gandhi did not become a nationalist while he was in England. That came later. Gandhi's nationalism developed slowly over the decades, and if we had to look for pivotal movements we would have to find them in South Africa and later in Jallianwalla Bagh. Bose arrived in England as a budding nationalist, and as somebody who was very conscious, and very resentful, of the racial basis of British rule in India. In England, he wrote one of his friends: "Nothing makes me happier than to be served by the whites and to watch them clean my shoes. In England, Bose's nationalism became more clearly defined, and more militant, than it had been before.

At the same time, Bose liked England. He enjoyed the openness of English society, the freedom of expression, the debates in Parliament and at the university, the fact that students weren't shadowed by the police. It made him acutely aware of how different life was in colonial India. Also, there was a lot that Bose admired about the British in England. He found them efficient and energetic, he appreciated their sense of a national interest, and what he saw as their can-do attitude. These qualities-efficiency, energy, discipline, a sense of punctuality-are all central to modern industrial society, and they became central to Bose's vision of what India should be like.

He did very well in the ICS exams, and then faced a dilemma that had, by the 1920's, become common for Indian nationalists. Should he join the lAS, and participate in the administration of India, or should he keep his distance from the colonial government? Would participation constitute collaboration? Eventually Bose decided to stay away from the IAS.

Quite apart from his qualms about the Indian Civil Service, there was another major factor that influenced his decision. Bose was one of those people who desperately needed a father-figure in his life. Ever since he had been a child, he had attached himself to his teachers and to various swamis, hoping to find somebody who could be a combination of spiritual advisor, political mentor, and intellectual guide. For Bose, who was already leaning towards a career in nationalist politics, one possible choice might have

been Gandhi, who served those functions for Nehru. But Bose never developed this intimacy with Gandhi. He admired Gandhi, but the philosophical differences were too great.

As he resigned from the Indian Civil Service, Bose finally found his father-figure. This was C.R. Das, who was another one of those nationalist lawyer-politicians active in the Congress. In some ways, Das was a curious choice of mentor for a hot-headed extremist like Bose. Das was the ultimate machine politician. He believed in building an administrative organization within the framework of the colonial government, and then running that organization as independently as possible. He did not look for revolution; rather like Gandhi, he believed in a gradual process of piecemeal concessions. Like Gandhi, he had responded to the Rowlatt Acts by throwing himself into the non-cooperation movement. He had abandoned his legal practice and his western suits, and adopting khadi and frugality, although he was never quite as frugal as Gandhi. Bose was drawn to C.R. Das primarily because he admired the latter's personal sacrifices. The fact that both men were Bengalis was also a factor. And perhaps, at a psychological level, Das-with his social, cultural and professional background-was sufficiently like Bose's own father.

So Bose wrote to C.R. Das, offering his services, and rather boldly outlining his own ideas of how to build a nationalist organization. Congress, he wrote, should have a permanent house. It should come up with a set of policies for all of India, including the princely states, It should have policies for improving the conditions of low-caste groups, It should have its own research and intelligence wing, and a well-organized public relations machine.

These ideas are important for several reasons, For one thing, they tell us a lot about how Bose was thinking about the present and the future. Already, in 1921, he wanted the Congress to function as a parallel government, This is something that very few people inside the Congress, including Gandhi, had given much thought to, or were comfortable contemplating, For another, these ideas highlight the emphasis Bose would place on efficient organization. They reflect his conviction that society's problems could be solved not through moral persuasion-which was the

Gandhian line-but through pressure exerted by powerful organizations, such as a parallel government, or an independent nation-state. Das was impressed by Bose's ideas, and invited Bose to work with him in Calcutta. So he went, and in 1921 he plunged immediately into hectic political activity mat fully utilized his talents as an organizer. Seeing a need to develop alternatives to the colonial educational system, Bose threw himself into creating a nationalist college. He set himself up as the principal, found professors who were willing to lecture, invented courses, developed course schedules, and even planned on taking some courses himself. All this was typical of the man: he wanted to be the leader, he wanted to plan and to organize, and at the same time he wanted to learn.

When he was not working on the nationalist college, Bose was organizing strikes and demonstrations in Calcutta as part of the non-cooperation movement. The British threw him in jail, along with C.R. Das and thousands of other activists, but this was pretty much what the non-cooperation movement aimed to achieve. He was released after six months, and was immediately back at work, doing what he did best: organizing large-scale operations. There had serious flooding in parts of Bengal. Bose, working with Congress volunteers, set up relief operations that were bigger and more effective than anything the Congress had done along those lines until then. Since the colonial government didn't do much to help the flood victims, Bose's reputation as an effective political leader grew larger.

At around this time, Bose began to have his first open disagreements with Gandhi. Actually, it was Das who had the disagreement with Gandhi, and initially Bose was involved only as Das' right-hand man, Das wanted the Congress to contest elections to local councils under the Montagu-Chelmsford Act of 1919, and to become actively involved in local government. Gandhi felt this would undermine non-cooperation, and refused. But Das had support within the Congress on this issue, particularly from the two Nehrus. They got together and formed the Swaraj Party. This was not really a separate party, but a group that remained within the overall Congress organization. Faced with this tension within the Congress, Gandhi compromised and allowed the Swaraj

Party to participate in the elections. In the 1924 elections to the Calcutta Municipal Corporation-*i.e.*, the city government of Calcutta-the Swaraj Party won a two-thirds majority. Bose became the Chief Executive Officer. In other words, at the age of 27, he was one of the most powerful men in the second-largest city of the British Empire. He loved the job: it allowed him to use his talent for developing and running big operations, to be innovative, and to be the boss. He took charge of all kinds of details, from designing city employees' uniforms, to creating new municipal programmes for education and public health.

In the meantime, the colonial secret service kept a close watch on him, and tried to come up with evidence that would bring him down. The colonial government had first noticed Bose during Oaten episode, and now he was seen as a particularly dangerous nationalist politician, who was becoming too powerful too fast. Eventually, in the fall of 1924, Bose was arrested on vague charges of conspiring with terrorists to kill the police commissioner of Calcutta.

The charges were almost certainly false. Bose probably sympathized with the terrorists, and may have helped them find jobs, etc., but it's totally implausible that he would have jeopardized his career at that stage by trying to kill his own police chief.

In any event, the British wanted to get him out of the country, and he was sent off to jail in Burma. His health broke down in prison, and he was eventually released in 1927. He came back to India and found that a lot had changed in his political fortunes. For one thing, C.R. Das had died, and the leadership of the Swaraj Party had been taken over by Gandhi loyalists. This left Bose without a secure foothold in the political establishment. He remained active in the Congress, but his moment at the center of power had passed. He went back to being the permanent outsider. In sonic ways, this freed him up, especially when it came to being able to criticize Gandhi. Now he had less to lose.

He spoke out strongly on two issues. Firstly, he criticized Gandhi's hostility to modern technology and mass He declared: "We have to live in the present and to adapt ourselves to modern conditions. The days of the bullock cart are gone forever." And, for those of you who have been following the recent controversy

over the Indian nuclear programme, he added: "Free India must arm herself for any eventuality as long as the whole world does not accept wholeheartedly the policy of disarmament."

His second point of disagreement with Gandhi was over the pace and the objectives of the nationalist movement. Gandhi tended to give the British a lot of time to respond to Congress demands, and there were long gaps between the periods of active agitation. Bose wanted immediate agitation, and could not understand why Gandhi always waited for the right moment. A true revolutionary, he felt, created the moment, rather than wait for it to arrive.

Also, Gandhi and his allies within the Congress were not, in 1928, ready to come out and demand complete independence. They preferred to define the nationalist goal as dominion status, *i.e.*, as autonomy within the British Empire. Bose found this unacceptable, and he did not hesitate to say so. Nevertheless, he was still working closely with the Congress. During the Congress' convention in Calcutta in 1928, Bose organized the ceremonies. In the process, he allowed his imagination to run wild: he put Congress volunteers in military-style uniforms, named himself General Officer Commanding, and held a military-style honour guard for Nehru senior. Once again, this was his childish delight in uniforms and smart salutes coming to the forefront. Most people didn't know whether to laugh or to cry. Gandhi, most likely, was not amused. In 1929, Bose was elected president of the Bengal branch of the Congress, defeating Gandhi's candidate. Not long after that, he was jailed for protesting the government's treatment of revolutionaries and political prisoners. In 1930 Gandhi finally gave the call for complete independence, and launched a new campaign of civil disobedience.

Bose watched the campaign from prison. While in prison, he was elected mayor of Calcutta. When he was released in the fall of 1930, he immediately went back to being the organizer of massive nationalist demonstrations. After a confrontation with the police in which he was violently assaulted, he was sent back to jail. For the time being, his career as an active politician in India came to an end.

Bose's health failed again in prison, and he went to Europe to recover. He spent most of the 1930's in Europe, shadowed by

the British secret service. Nevertheless, he travelled extensively in Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Ireland and eastern Europe. He developed extensive contacts with the European left as well as with the right, both of which had reasons to be anti-Britain, and to welcome Bose as a man who was fighting the British in India. He met Mussolini, discussed his revolutionary plans with him, and Mussolini was suitably impressed.

This period in Europe had a profound effect on Bose's politics. For one thing, his exposure to the left sharpened his faith in revolutionary socialism, and his determination to lead a socialist revolution in India. For another, his exposure to the right gave him an admiration for the techniques of organization and administration that the Nazis were trying out in Germany, and that Mussolini's fascists had been trying out in Italy.

We now have to deal with the question of Bose's political ideology at this point, especially the question of whether or not he was a fascist. Well, in a word: yes, Bose was now a fascist. He had no problems with openly admiring fascism. At the same time, he was not a Nazi, in the sense that he was not a racist, and he had no interest in theories of national purity and cultural supremacy. Bose did not seek a Hindu India, or some pure version of Indian culture. He had long outgrown his old politics of Hindu nostalgia. He welcomed Muslim participation in Indian nationalism, and he did not hesitate when it came to forming alliances with Muslim politicians.

For Bose, fascism was a technique of political organization, and a diagram for relations between government and society. Bose was not a democrat. He may have been one in the 1920's, but by the late 1930's he was quite certain that parliamentary democracy was not suitable for India. In his mind, India needed firm control by a single party, which would direct every aspect of social, political, economic and even personal life.

He believed that India's problems-such as caste discrimination, class injustice, the need for economic modernization, etc.-were so deep-rooted that mey could only be weeded out through massive state intervention. For this, Bose believed, the machinery of the state had to be in the hands of a single, powerful, reforming party organization, such as the Nazi Party in Germany or the Communist

Party in the Soviet Union. At this point, he still believed that this party would be the Congress. Bose finally returned to India in January of 1937. He was now much more radical than he had been when he had left. He was quick to reject the Government of India Act of 1935, which had allowed for greater Indian participation in the provincial governments. For Bose, the law was too little too late. He was unhappy that the Congress had agreed to participate in the government under the Act, but this did not keep him away from Congress politics. The years in Europe had not diminished his popularity in India, and he had no trouble getting elected as the president of the Congress. He remained president for only a year, before Gandhi schemed to bring him down.

But for that one year, Bose was king, and he enjoyed himself thoroughly. As in the past, he threw himself into building Congress up as a practical parallel government. In keeping with his faith in modern technology, he set up a committee of prominent scientists to develop a viable industrial policy. He raised funds, and he campaigned tirelessly all over India. He emphasized his socialist ideals, and along with Nehru, became the recognized leader of the Congress left. But Bose and Nehru did not become political allies. There are several reasons. There were the philosophical differences: Nehru was a democrat, Bose was authoritarian. Also Nehru, at heart, was something of an Anglophile, in the sense that he had a soft spot for India's connection with England. Bose had no such sentimental attachment. Then there were differences in temperament that played out in the way they each approached socialism and policy-making. Nehru was a visionary without much interest in the details of implementing his visions. But details mattered to Bose. And finally, there was the Gandhi factor.

In spite of his philosophical differences with Gandhi, Nehru was Gandhi's protege, and everybody knew it. Nehru would disagree with Gandhi on specific issues, but when push came to shove and a decision had to be made, he would give in and let Gandhi have his way. This was partly Out of a genuine respect for Gandhi's leadership, and partly because Nehru understood very well that his own political fortunes were linked to Gandhi's. As long as Nehru was Gandhi's boy, his own future within the Congress organization was insured. This reluctance to go up against

Gandhi meant that when Gandhi turned on Bose, Nehru made no real effort to defend his fellow-socialist.

When Bose had been elected Congress president, Gandhi had accepted it. The break came in the fall of 1938, when war in Europe became a distinct possibility. Bose and the left saw the possibility of war as a tremendous political opportunity, and wanted to use this opportunity to pressure the colonial government for immediate concessions. Gandhi and the Congress right, on the other hand, wanted to issue a much weaker resolution, hoping that the British would simply do the right thing if war broke out. Bose and the left refused to give in, and Gandhi was furious. Even though Bose was the Congress president at this time, Gandhi had long enjoyed the status of the unofficial super-president of the Congress, and he did not like Bose's disobedience.

Bose was up for re-election in January of 1939, and Gandhi decided to block him. Quite apart from his personal animosity, there were real issues involved. Bose wanted the Congress to walk away from implementing the Government of India Act of 1935. He also wanted to give the colonial government an ultimatum demanding immediate independence, and to begin all-out civil disobedience if the government refused. Gandhi and the Congress right felt otherwise. In any event, Bose won his re-election, narrowly defeating P. Sitaramayya, who was Gandhi's chosen candidate.

Gandhi now worked actively to bring Bose down. The Congress constitution provided only two ways for getting rid of the president: he could be voted Out of office, or he could resign. Since Gandhi was unwilling to wait for the next election, he decided to force Bose to resign. Even though Bose was the Congress president, Gandhi's supporters controlled the party's Working Committee. Without their cooperation, the president could not operate effectively; it was a system of checks and balances similar to what we have in the US government.

Gandhi's supporters now resigned, and Bose found himself unable to form a new Working Committee against Gandhi's opposition. He tried hard to work out a compromise with Gandhi. He even offered to let Gandhi nominate the entire Working Committee, if Gandhi would only accept Bose's plan to launch an agitation for immediate independence. Gandhi politely refused,

and Bose had no option except to resign, four months into his second term as president. One of the interesting things about this whole episode is that Bose blamed Nehru more than he blamed Gandhi. He never completely cut his ties with Gandhi, and continued to try to rebuild his bridges. But he never forgave Nehru for not helping him during this crisis. On September 3 of 1939, war finally broke out in Europe. And not just in Europe, because the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow declared war on India's behalf, without consulting a single Indian. This was a major embarrassment for the Congress, which was now faced with two choices. It could either get some significant concessions from the colonial government. Or it could resign from the ministries it controlled under the Government of India Act. So the Congress went to the government, and asked for a clear statement of its military objectives.

The government stonewalled, saying that it was too early in the war to talk about military objectives. It also refused to talk about Indian independence, saying that any such discussion would have to wait until after the war. Since there was no clearly defined military objective, it meant that the government would decide when the war was over, and when Indian independence could be discussed. Congress now resigned from its ministries. It's been suggested that the British deliberately maneuvered Congress into resigning, to have a free hand in running the government during the war. Whatever the case may be, the Congress now found itself out of office, and with nothing but moral outrage to show for it. Still Gandhi refused to launch an agitation.

Bose, meanwhile, had been busy organizing his own party, called the Forward Bloc. This was initially within the structure of the Congress. But by 1940 it had become an independent political party, mainly because the Congress had refused to tolerate its allegiance to Bose instead of to Gandhi, and had kicked its officers out of office. Things were happening very fast for Bose, as usual. In July of 1940, he was arrested and sent to prison again for planning to lead a march demanding the removal of a memorial to the victims of the Black Hole of Calcutta. He went on a hunger-strike, and in December he was released. Then began his great adventure. Even before his last arrest, Bose had begun to think

about getting himself Out of India. He felt that there was little that he could achieve in India under the circumstances. His career in the Congress had stalled, and besides, the Congress was unwilling to do what he wanted it to do. The war, he felt, was too important an opportunity to waste. So he came up with a plan. He would escape from India, get to the Soviet Union, and then go on to Germany. When he got to Germany, he would persuade the Germans to help him in his fight against the British in India.

Bose now contacted a communist organization in Punjab. He asked if they might be able to smuggle him across the border into Afghanistan, and through Afghanistan into the USSR. They told him it was possible. In the winter of 1940-41 his journey began. Disguised as a Muslim life-insurance agent, Bose escaped from his family home in Calcutta in the middle of the night. He boarded a train at a remote rural station, and travelled to Peshawar on the border between Punjab and Afghanistan. From there, in a new disguise as a deaf-mute Pathan, and accompanied by his communist contact, he trekked across the desert to Kabul. His plan to travel across the border directly into the Soviet Union had been discarded as impractical. His current plan was to contact the Soviet embassy in Kabul.

Kabul in the 1940's was basically a truck-stop village with embassies. Bose, still posing as a deaf-mute, stayed at truck-drivers' hotel for weeks, trying to contact the Russians. He had no luck, the Russians suspected that he was a British agent trying to infiltrate the Soviet Union. Next Bose contacted the Germans. They heard him out, and were intrigued by his ideas, but dragged their feet. Eventually it was the Italians who rescued him. The Italian diplomat in Kabul was fascinated by Bose's plans. He gave Bose an Italian passport and the name Orlando Mazzotta, and persuaded the Germans and the Soviets to help him. Finally, in March of 1941, Bose travelled to the Soviet border in a diplomatic car, took a train to Moscow, and then flew to Berlin.

Bose remained in Germany for the next two years. He offered the Germans a deal. If they helped him, he said, he could trigger a revolution in India. Having to deal with a revolutionary situation in India would distract British forces from the war against Germany. In the process, Britain would lose the war with Germany,

and lose India simultaneously. This was the big picture. To bring all this about, Bose put forward several ideas. Some of these he accomplished; in others areas he was frustrated. Let's look at his political objectives first. Bose wanted facilities for broadcasting radio messages into India. This the Germans readily provided, and he made regular speeches directed at the Indian public. In his broadcasts, Bose urged people to use the war as an opportunity to break free. Germany would win the war, and the British should not be allowed to hang on in India. The first broadcasts created a sensation in India, largely because Bose's disappearance had generated a lot of public interest. But it didn't go much further than that. This was because in spite of Bose's presence in Berlin, to most Indians the war with Germany was still far away, and people couldn't really visualize the German army sweeping through the Caucasus to liberate India. Also, by this time, Gandhi and the Congress had finally launched the Quit India movement, and a violent revolutionary situation already existed in India.

Bose's other major accomplishment in Germany was organizing the Indian Legion. In the course of the fighting in north Africa, the Germans had taken thousands of Indian POWs. Bose went to the POW camps, and asked the Indian soldiers to join him to fight against the British. This idea was not entirely new. An expatriate Indian named Mohammed Iqbal Shedai had already made a start organizing Indian POWs captured by the Italians. For a while, Bose and Shedai ran parallel efforts with the POWs. Then the Indian soldiers in Shedai's camp mutinied, This discredited Shedai, and left Bose as the only Indian organizing an army to fight on the side of the Axis.

Ultimately, the Indian Legion that Bose organized in Germany numbered about 3000 soldiers. It was not easy putting this force together. Initially, when Bose visited the POW camps to talk to the soldiers, he got a hostile reception. The British Indian Army may have been an army without a nationalist ideology, but it would be a mistake to think of it as a purely mercenary force. The colonial army had its own ideology, which was a combination of loyalty to the British throne, loyalty to the commanding officer, loyalty to the regiment, and a tradition of service in which the same family or same village sent many generations of soldiers into

the Army. But Bose persisted. He had the men separated from their officers, and talked to them one on one. Eventually, he got through. He promised them proper treatment from the Germans, appropriate rank, pay and benefits, and he promised them victory. The British, he told them, were certain to lose the war; they were like a dead snake that people continue to fear. If only they shook off this fear, Bose said, victory and freedom would be theirs.

Bose had planned that when the German swing through the southern USSR and the Middle East reached India, the Indian Legion would spearhead the attack on India. He anticipated that this would have two results. One was that when the soldiers of the colonial Indian Army faced the Indian Legion, they would refuse to continue to fight for the British and desert en masse to Bose's side. The other was that an invasion of India by Indian Legion would galvanize the Indian population into rising up against the British, and make Bose's task easier.

As things turned out, however, the Indian Legion came to a rather sad end. First, the Russians stopped the German advance at the battle of Stalingrad. This, combined with the defeat at El Alamein, meant that the Germans would be unlikely to get anywhere near India. Second, after Bose left Germany in 1943, the Legion was left without an effective leader to look Out for them. They were absorbed into the German army and deployed in France. Now they knew they weren't going to be fighting for India's freedom, and their morale and discipline disintegrated. Many deserted, some joined the French resistance, and the rest disappeared in the chaos of the German retreat.

Bose's biggest frustration in Germany had to do with diplomatic recognition. He wanted Germany to officially recognize India as independent, and him as the leader of a government in exile. This the Germans refused to give him. The reasons lay partly in apathy, partly in the Master Race mentality, and partly in the peculiarities of Hitler's vision of the postwar world.

Hitler was not entirely comfortable with the idea of helping Indians-whom he saw as racially inferior-to defeat the British. The British were Aryans, after all. In his own way, Hitler admired the English, and through much of the war he continued to hope that he could come to some kind of an understanding with Britain:

essentially, that Germany would get a free hand in Europe, and England would get to keep most of its empire. He was perfectly willing to use Bose to make trouble for the British, but he had no long-term interest in India's future, one way or another. Bose knew this, of course. He wanted to use the Germans for his own purposes. But eventually, as things turned out, neither was able to do very much for the other side.

But by the middle of 1942, Bose was already looking beyond Germany, to Japan. The string of Japanese victories after Pearl Harbor had achieved two things. One was that Singapore, which was a major British military stronghold, had fallen to the Japanese. This placed tens of thousands of Indian soldiers in Japanese hands. What Bose had tried to do with the Indian Legion in Germany, he could try in Southeast Asia on a much larger scale. The other thing that encouraged Bose was the fact that Japanese forces had come all the way to the Indian border with Burma. In other words, if he could organize an army in Japanese-occupied territory, and attack on India would be a relatively practical idea.

So, in February of 1943, the Germans did Bose one last favour: they helped him get to Japan. He travelled in a German submarine to the coast of Mozambique, where he transferred to a Japanese submarine. This submarine took him to southeast Asia.

The former British colonies of southeast Asia-Burma, Malaya, and Singapore-had large Indian populations, and Bose was welcomed as a conquering hero. In a sense, they had been waiting for him; in spite of all efforts to keep his plans secret, rumours had been circulating that he would come. The Japanese welcomed him also, and were far more enthusiastic about working with him than the Germans had been.

I'll give you an example of the difference in attitude: when Bose was on the German sub, he ate bread that tasted like it had been dipped in diesel. On the Japanese sub, the crew had brought along Indian spices especially for him, and cooked him Indian curries until he protested about the frequent meals. After he reached Asia, Bose travelled widely in the Japanese-help territories: to Burma, Malaya, Singapore, the Philippines, Vietnam, occupied China, and of course Japan. Unlike his uneasy relationship with Hitler, he quickly developed an excellent relationship with Tojo.

The Japanese gave Bose two things which he had wanted very badly: diplomatic recognition as the premier of free India, and a real army. Let's talk about his political status first. He didn't have a territory, but he had a people: the Indian population of southeast Asia was placed under his jurisdiction. Bose got all the privileges and trappings of a head of state: the motorcade, the official aircraft, the honour guards, the works, He enjoyed it. In part, this was sheer megalomania: his old love of playing the great leader was resurfacing with a vengeance. In part, however, Bose recognized that it was necessary for him to play this role if was to deal effectively with the Japanese. He did not have any illusions about how the Japanese treated subject peoples. He knew that if he, and the Indians of southeast Asia, were to be taken seriously as allies, he had to insist upon his own status as an important political leader.

Bose did in fact run a real government in southeast Asia. I'm referring not to his status as leader of the government-in-exile of India, but to his status as leader of the local Indians. The regime Bose put together in Singapore, with the help of people who came forward to work with him, had the power to make and enforce laws, to collect taxes, and to recruit soldiers for the army. This people who paid the taxes and obeyed the laws did so willingly at first. Towards the end of the war, this cooperation became strained. As the Japanese collapsed and Tokyo's funding for Bose's army dried up, Bose pressed the local Indians for higher war taxes, and punished people who tried to hold back. This cost him some of his local popularity.

The army, to some extent, already existed when Bose arrived in Asia. After the fall of Singapore, an Indian officer named Mohan Singh had created the Indian National Army, or the INA as it came to be known, from Indian POWs. This force was much larger than the Indian Legion in Germany. As such, it was a viable military and political resource. Mohan Singh himself had rather an unhappy career with the INA. Soldiers had joined the INA on the understanding that they would fight only on the Indian front. When the Japanese tried to send the INA to fight in other parts of southeast Asia, several units mutinied. These units were disbanded, and Mohan Singh ended up in a Japanese prison.

This was, in a way, a parallel of what had happened in Europe with Shedai's army. When Bose came to Asia, he quickly assumed command of what was left of Mohan Singh's old INA. At this time, this force had only 13,000 soldiers. But Bose had big plans. He wanted to expand the INA in two phases, first to 50,000 soldiers, and then to a force of 3 million. The men would come from the colonial Indian Army as well as from the southeast Asian Indian community.

The Japanese were shocked at such an ambitious plan, and told Bose that they would be able to arm a much smaller force, of about 30,000. Eventually, the INA reached a peak strength of around 50,000. It was an interesting social experiment in more ways than one. The colonial Indian Army had organized its units around ethnicity and religion, so that the British could play off one group of Indians against another if necessary. In contrast, the INA had fully integrated units. It also had a regiment of female troops: this was the Rani of Jhansi Brigade, named after the queen who had died fighting the British in the Rebellion of 1857.

For Bose, the big numbers were necessary for their political effect. It didn't matter if most of the 3 million weren't equipped with adequate weapons. He saw the INA as a psychological force as well as a military asset. He knew that if people in India became aware that a nationalist army of 3 million was waiting just across the border, ready to invade, it would have a tremendous effect on the way Indians related to the British. It would inspire pride and confidence, it would take away the fear of British power, and it would make it impossible for the British to maintain control.

In fact, Bose's whole strategy for using the INA depended upon this psychological factor. He wanted the force to spearhead a Japanese invasion, expecting that this would totally demoralize and dissolve the colonial Indian army, ,,,drawing its soldiers into the INA. He expected also that the general public would respond with overwhelming support.

It turned out that he was half right. The INA lost the war, but won the peace. In the summer of 1944, the Japanese were finally ready to begin their invasion of India. They attacked from Burma in a two-pronged approach, hoping to capture the town of Imphal. This would then become the base for the rest of the invasion. But,

at this critical point in Bose's plan, everything that could go wrong went wrong, The monsoon came early, and the Japanese assault became bogged down in the rain and the mud.

Also, by this point, the war in the Pacific was going very badly for the Japanese. Therefore the Japanese had allocated most of their air power to the Pacific theatre, leaving their forces in the Burma-India theatre without any air cover. This gave the British a crucial advantage.

Then there were other factors. Food rations became exhausted. Allied air strikes cut the supply lines. Japanese and INA units found themselves eating grass and jungle flowers to stay alive. Japanese commanders on the ground made some serious tactical errors. Normally, when things are going well, a few mistakes don't have to be fatal. But by 1944 the Japanese had overreached their capabilities. The attack on Imphal failed, and the counterattack was devastatingly effective. The INA became caught up in this disaster, and never recovered. The INA's coordination with Japanese units was poor to begin with. Once things began to go badly for the Japanese, INA units became stranded. Some units fought well and there were plenty of individual heroics to go around, but it made no difference to the overall failure.

The biggest failure was the INA's inability to break up the morale of the colonial Indian Army, which did most of the fighting at Imphal, and which played a major role in the Allied counterattack. Bose had expected that when the INA met the British Indian Army, colonial troops would immediately desert to the nationalist side. This did not happen. Bose had seriously underestimated the ideological strength of the colonial military. In fact, what often happened was the reverse. Starving and out of ammunition in the jungle, shocked by the failure of the Japanese offensive, many INA troops were eager to return to their old units and their old comrades in the colonial army. There were over 700 desertions, and eventually Bose had to give orders that deserters would be shot on suspicion.

After the Imphal defeat, the Japanese retreated steadily through Burma and into Malaya, pursued by British and colonial Indian troops. The INA retreated with them. This retreat, ironically, brought Out Bose's best qualities as a leader. On the long trek

from Burma to Bankok, followed closely by British tanks and under frequent attack from the air, he marched for days on end, refusing the offer of a car while his men had to walk. Throughout the march, he made sure that INA troops had proper food and medical care. In the chaos of the retreat, Bose was their best protection, and everybody knew it. Without him, the Japanese would have been only too eager to abandon the INA.

Bose returned to Singapore and tried for a while to rebuild the INA. This was the period when he demanded ten percent of the value of peoples assets to pay for military expenses, and made himself unpopular with the wealthier Indians in Malaya. But for Japan, the war was almost over. After the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there was nothing left for Bose in working with Tokyo.

He now made a political gamble. The Soviets had been an ally of the British during the war, and an enemy of his allies, the Germans and the Japanese. But Bose correctly foresaw that the Soviet alliance with the west would not last. He decided to travel to Manchuria, which had just been overrun by the USSR. He planned to continue his fight against the British, but from Russia this time.

On 16th August, a day after the Japanese surrendered, Bose boarded a Japanese bomber in Saigon, on his way to Darien, in China. On the 18th of August, after a refueling stop in Taipei, the bomber crashed. Bose was still alive, but badly burned. He died in a Japanese military hospital in Taipei, soon afterwards.

The story didn't end there, During the war, the British had carefully suppressed all news about the INA. This news now finally broke in India. Bose immediately became a hero of mythical proportions. People refused to believe he was dead; in fact, people refused to believe it for decades.

Also, Bose's predictions about the psychological value of his army were finally vindicated. The British played into his hands by making a series of miscalculations about how to deal with 25,000 captured INA soldiers. Misreading the public mood, the British decided to stage a series of highly publicized trials of INA officers in New Delhi. Incredibly, they believed that since the INA had taken up arms against Indians in the colonial army, the Indian public would want them to be severely punished.

Exactly the opposite happened. When three INA officers-Shah Nawaz Khan, G.S. Dhillon and Prem Kumar Sahgal-were put on trial for treason and murder in the Red Fort, the public quickly grasped the symbolism of the affair. The three officers included a Hindu, a Muslim and a Sikh. In other words, all three of India's major religious communities were seen as being on trial for having come together to fight for their country. The fact that the trials were being held at the Red Fort, where the last independent Indian regime had been based, was seen as an added insult. Even before the trials began, celebrations honouring the INA were held all over India. When the trials did begin, anti-British crowds besieged the Red Fort, and more than a hundred people were killed or injured by police firing. In Calcutta, Hindus and Muslims, flying the flags of the Congress as well as the Muslim League, attacked British and American military bases. Scores of military vehicles were damaged or destroyed. Over 200 military personnel were injured, and 32 Indians were killed. The violence soon spread across much of northern India, all the way to Bombay and Karachi.

Congress leaders like Gandhi and Nehru, who had been uncomfortable with Bose while he was alive, now eagerly jumped on the INA bandwagon. Nehru put on his old lawyer's robes and participated in the defense of the officers on trial. Gandhi made speeches praising Bose. Confronted by this public hostility, the British found themselves unable to punish the INA prisoners as severely as they would have liked. Most got commuted sentences, or short prison terms. Nevertheless, the British persisted with the trials, and the violence continued to grow. Early in 1946, martial law had to be declared in Calcutta.

At around the same time, Indian troops in the colonial navy and air force mutinied, citing sympathy for the INA as well as unhappiness about their conditions of service. Within days, 78 warships had pulled down the Union Jack. Fierce battles erupted in the streets of Karachi and Bombay, in which tanks and machine-guns were used. In Bombay, the mutineers were supported by the working class. 600,000 textile workers went on strike, and joined

the sailors in street battles against British forces. The rebels eventually failed, in part because they didn't have the firepower that the British were able to call in, and in part because the Congress panicked and told them to stop fighting. The mutineers had looked to the Congress and the Muslim League to lead them. By the spring of 1946, however, the Congress and the League were too deeply implicated in the government of the country to see any good in this kind of unrest. Leaders like Nehru and Jinnah knew that independence was now at the most only a couple of years away. As such, they did not want to encourage something as messy, as volatile and as dangerous as an armed rebellion. They had no experience and no stomach for leading this kind of movement, and they quietly supported the British efforts to crush the rebels. But Bose's predictions about what would happen when the INA entered India had, to a considerable degree, come true, He had predicted a public uprising and sympathy from colonial troops, and now he was proved right. This is what I meant when I said that the INA lost the war but won the peace. But if Bose was right, where did he go wrong?

Well, as I've argued, that Bose misread the nature of the colonial army. On the battlefield, when everything was at stake, the colonial army retained its loyalties. It was only after the war that sections of it mutinied.

It can also be argued that Bose misread the political situation in India in the 1940's. Being away in Germany and southeast Asia had isolated him from the political realities of wartime India, and he had missed some crucial changes in the way the wind was blowing. By 1942, the British were willing to discuss independence for India when the war ended. By 1945, there was no doubt that negotiations would soon begin. Yet Bose continued to fight a military battle, instead of rejoining the political process.

Was this unnecessary, and a mistake? Not if you were in Bose's shoes. He had taken up arms against the British, and his relations with the Congress had collapsed. He had reason to believe that if he returned to India while it was controlled by the British or the Congress, he would be treated as a war criminal.

Also, although India was clearly on its way to independence by the mid-40's, this was not the kind of independence that Bose

had wanted. For Bose, the revolution at home was as important as throwing out the British, and for this he needed to be completely in charge. He did not believe that the replacement of British rule by a conservative parliamentary democracy would not bring about fundamental changes in the structure of Indian society.

This brings us some of the most basic questions about Bose, the nationalist and the politician. What are we to make of the fact that he wanted to invite the Germans and the Japanese to invade India? And how do we reconcile his heroic status with the fact that he aligned himself with Nazi Germany, and that he openly advocated dictatorship as the best form of government for India?

Perhaps the biggest weakness in Bose's plan was his belief that even after bringing the Japanese into India, he could maintain effective control of the country. At a diplomatic level, he had grounds for believing he could pull this off. He refused to take India into the Japanese Co-Prosperity Sphere, which was the euphemism the Japanese used for their new empire in Asia, The Japanese accepted Bose's decision on this. Still, if the invasion of India had succeeded, it is difficult to see how he could have remained fully independent of Japanese control.

Bose felt that since the people of India would be with him, he would be able to resist Japanese demands. He knew that India was a long way from Japan, and that the Japanese were already at the limits of their capabilities. He also pointed out that the American revolutionaries had accepted assistance from France, and this didn't make the US a French colony. He may have had a point. But this analogy has its limits. Given the fact the INA was completely dependent on Japan for arms and ammunition, and that it would take time to develop an industrial infrastructure in India, Japan would probably have had a lot of leverage.

There is no getting away from the fact that Bose deliberately ignored the moral evil that Nazi Germany represented. He had lived in Germany for much of the 1930s and the early 40s. He must have known something of what was going on. He had the courage to speak out against some of the racist aspects of the Nazi ideology, and even speak his mind to Hitler himself. But he was not sufficiently disturbed by Nazism to reject Hitler's help. Similarly, his alliance with Japan ignored the atrocities that the

Japanese had perpetrated against people in the countries they had occupied. Unlike Gandhi and Nehru, Bose believed that the end justified the means. He wanted freedom for India, and to some extent, he didn't care who he had to approach for assistance. But this explanation, I think, is too kind to Bose. At some basic level, Bose had an ideological affinity for fascism, and he was a little too comfortable with using the state to crush dissent and ideological diversity. Indians who refused to believe that Bose was dead, and who continued to believe for decades that he was alive somewhere in the Soviet Union, hoped he would just surface again some day like a messiah, and solve all of India's problems. Yet these people misunderstand Bose, and what he stood for. Had the INA and Bose succeeded on the battlefield, a free India would have been a totalitarian society.

Bose was passionate in his patriotism, and genuinely well-intentioned. He was genuine in his desire to help the disadvantaged segments of Indian society. But good intentions are not enough. Some of the greatest tyrants of the 20th century had good intentions: Lenin, Mao, Pol Pot. (You'll notice that these are all tyrants of the left. Tyrants of the right like Hitler, Franco, or the Shah of Iran, don't get credit for good intentions.) Bose didn't seem to realize that the methods you choose do matter in the final analysis. Totalitarian institutions inevitably corrupt even the best-intentioned people. Even if it hadn't corrupted Bose himself, even if he had remained a so-called benevolent dictator, there would have been no guarantees that his successor would have been benevolent. Ultimately, dying at the end of the war was the best thing Bose could have done for India.

British 'Attempted to Kill Bose'

The British told their agents to assassinate India's independence war leader Subhash Chandra Bose in 1941, an Irish historian has claimed. Eunan O'Halpin, who has written several books on British intelligence, says the order came after Bose sought support of the Axis powers in World War II. British agents were told to intercept and kill Bose before he reached Germany via the Middle East, Mr O'Halpin says. Bose is believed to have died in a plane crash in Taiwan in 1945.

Puzzled

Mr O'Halpin says that once they found Bose was planning to oust the British with active support of the Axis powers, British intelligence was given "clear orders" to assassinate him in 1941.

"It appears to be a last desperate measure against someone who had thrown the Empire in complete panic" Eunan O'Halpin In a lecture in Calcutta, Mr O'Halpin cited a recently declassified intelligence document referring to a top-secret instruction to the Special Operations Executive (SOE) of British intelligence to murder Bose. Mr O'Halpin says the British were initially puzzled about the whereabouts of Bose after his escape from Calcutta in January 1941.

"They thought he had gone to the Far East, but they soon intercepted Italian diplomatic communication and came to know Bose was in Kabul, planning to reach Germany through the Middle East," said Mr O'Halpin. "Two SOE operatives in Turkey were instructed by their headquarters in London to intercept Bose and kill him before he reached Germany," the Irish professor, who teaches at Trinity College, Dublin, said.

Mr O'Halpin said the SOE operatives in Turkey failed to because Bose reached Germany through Central Asia and the Soviet Union. "Every time [the operatives] checked back, headquarters told them the orders were intact and Bose must be killed if found."

Mystique

Describing the decision as "extraordinary, unusual and rare", Mr O'Halpin said the British took Bose "much more seriously than many thought". He added: "Historians working on the subject tell me the plan to liquidate Bose has few parallels. It appears to be a last desperate measure against someone who had thrown the Empire in complete panic."

Other historians who have worked on Bose say this will add to the mystique of India's most charismatic independence war figure.

"Bose would have reasons to compliment himself if he knew that the British were desperate enough to plan his assassination.

That's a measure of how seriously they took him," says Calcutta historian, Lipi Ghosh. In retrospect, she says, the British had correctly assessed the potential of Bose.

Sugata Bose, Gardiner professor of history at Harvard University and a grand-nephew of Bose. said: "Since he ultimately managed to swing the loyalty of the Indian soldiers to the national cause from the King Emperor, they had all the reasons to contemplate the worst." After 20 years in the Indian National Congress, Bose was elected its president but quit in disgust at Gandhi's plans for nonviolent struggle. After reaching Germany he travelled to East Asia in a 90-day submarine journey to set up the Indian National Army from soldiers who had surrendered to Japan. Bose's army fought with the Japanese in the Imphal-Kohima campaign in 1944-1945.

The Strategy

"The time has come when I can openly tell the whole world, including our enemies, as to how it is proposed to bring about national liberation. Indians outside India, particularly Indians in East Asia, are going to organise a fighting force which will be powerful enough to attack the British Army in India. When we do so, a revolution will break out, not only among the civil population at home, but also among the Indian Army which is now standing under the British flag. When the British government is thus attacked from both sides-from inside India and from outside-it will collapse, and the Indian people will then regain their liberty. According to my plan, it is not even necessary to bother about the attitude of the Axis powers towards India. If Indians outside and inside India will do their duty, it is possible for the Indian people to throw the British out of India and liberate 388 millions of their countrymen."-*Speech by Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose at a mass rally, Singapore, 9 July 1943*

The Alternative Hero of the India's Struggle for Freedom....

> *It is 23 January 1981, and crowds all over India are celebrating the birthday of Subhash Bose. Politicians who have never known him, and many who fought him when he was alive, garland his statues, invoke his name and urge their audiences to follow his example. More than thirty years after his death Bose has become a myth: the alternative hero of the Indian struggle for freedom. And the banners at these meetings tell their own story. 'Subhash Bose 1897-1981'. Subhash Bose is not dead. One day he will return and rescue India.*

The legends and the myths have been a long time in the making, and they express a deeper Indian unease: had he lived and returned to India after the war, he would have shaped a country far more successful than the one wrought by his rivals and successors: an India united, strong and fearless. Bose became a legend in his own lifetime, but his transformation into a myth fit to rank with ancient Hindu classics came after his death, through forces he had himself tried to harness for his cause. They were catalysed through the British decision to hold a symbolic trial of certain I.N.A. men in the Red Fort of Delhi.

The Decision to try the I.N.A....

> *The end of the war saw the I.N.A. (Indian National Army) scattered all over east Asia and in deep depression. As its personnel were finally shipped back to India they found the country ignorant of their existence and firmly under British control. 'Not a dog barked as they flew us back,' was how one officer recalled the journey home.*

But within days of Japan's defeat the British had begun to think about the I.N.A. problem. London had left it for Delhi to decide, but Delhi was deeply divided and had yet to be convinced that Bose was in fact dead. On 24 August, the day the Japanese government announced the death, Wavell recorded in his diary:

> *'I wonder if the Japanese announcement of Subhash Chandra Bose's death in an air-crash is true, I suspect it very much, it is just what would be given out if he meant to go underground.'*

He asked his Home Member, Sir R. F. Mudie, to prepare a note for the trial of Bose and the I.N.A.

Mudie could find nothing even in the extended definition of 'war criminal' that could be said to include Bose. His advisers were deeply worried about the consequences of a trial and the Home Department note he sent to Wavell acknowledged the difficulties of handling Bose. British interrogation of the I.N.A. and the other Indians in east Asia had established that, contrary

to their own propaganda, Bose was regarded not as a puppet of the Japanese but as a great hero. He had dealt with the Japanese as an equal and had succeeded in creating India's first national army. Then there was his undoubted prestige and status in India, particularly in Bengal, where he 'ranks little, if anything, below Gandhi as an all-India figure'.

After listing the various measures that could be taken to deal with Bose, the report went on to discuss their drawbacks. Public pressure would not allow him to be hanged in India; the Burma government was unlikely to want to try him there; trials in Singapore or elsewhere would create just as many problems. A quick military execution was a solution, but that could hardly be defended, and the military might read it as a subterfuge to avoid the independence issue which would figure in a civil trial. Imprisoning him would only lead to agitation for his release. The report concluded:

> *"In many ways the easiest course would be to leave him where he is and not ask for his release. He might, of course, in certain circumstances be welcomed by the Russians. This course would raise fewest immediate political difficulties but the security authorities consider that in certain circumstances his presence in Russia would be so dangerous as to rule it out altogether."*

After several investigations, the British had concluded by March 1946 that Bose might still be alive; but there was not much else they could do about it. The 25,000 I.N.A. prisoners being repatriated to India presented very different problems. Senior British Army commanders were convinced that the I.N.A. were traitors, and that, if the integrity and the discipline of the British Indian Army were to be maintained, they should be severely punished. Some would have preferred kangaroo courts and quick executions.

But the higher echelons of the Raj were not entirely convinced that this was the right policy; in any case, it was not possible to execute 25,000 men secretly. A few were executed, but for the great majority a more selective policy was implemented. They were classified into 'whites'-those who had joined the I.N.A. with the intention of re-joining the British; 'greys'-those who had been misled by Bose and the Japanese; and 'blacks'-those who had fervently believed in the cause. The whites were to be restored to their former positions in the army, the greys were to be tried, dismissed and released; only the blacks were to bear the full brunt of British revenge. They were beyond redemption, and Auchinleck was convinced that when their full story emerged the Indian public would be horrified.

The I.N.A. was already housed in camps set up in Delhi's lied Fort, and this, it was decided, would be an excellent place for a trial. The Fort was ideally situated for press and media coverage. On 5 November 1945 the trial of Shah Nawaz Khan, Prem Kumar Salgal and Gurbaksh Singh Dhillon began. Dhillon was charged with murder, Shah Nawaz and Sahgal with abetting murder. All three were charged with 'waging war against His Majesty the King Emperor of India'. The trials lasted till 31 December, and proved to be a sensation-though not in the way Claude Auchinleck wished.

The Trial & the Revolutionary Response of the Indian People....

> *The war had not brought Indian independence any nearer, and the British mistook the political quiet for approval. But almost nine months after the end of the war, when the British in Delhi held their victory celebrations, the Indians went wild with fury: the old Delhi town hall was partly gutted, Indians dressed in European clothes were attacked, parading troops were booed and the police had to open fire in order to restore order.*

The I.N.A. and Bose had created a potentially revolutionary situation: one on which the political parties were eager to build for their own ends-none more so than the Congress.

The Congress had suffered a double defeat during the war: it had gained little through either negotiations or mass struggle, and now it was a case of 'the Congress proposes, the Muslim League disposes'. In these circumstances the Congress soon realised the potential of the fervour behind the I.N.A., and it quickly adopted resolutions both approving of their actions and pledging itself to defend them at the trial. A party dedicated to nonviolence was at last beginning to realise the usefulness of violence.

Even Jinnah urged the government to treat the I.N.A. prisoners with 'leniency'. By now the Indian press-freed from wartime

censorship-was full of stories and legends of the I.N.A. and Bose. 'Jai Hind' had replaced all other greetings between Indians, and Bose's photographs-invariably in I.N.A. uniform-now graced a million pan shops.

The defence was led by Bhulabhai Desai, who in the past had been a bitter critic of Bose. By the time of his death, a few months after the trial, he was as great a champion of Netaji as any. The trial became, as Nehru said, a dramatic version of that old contest, England versus India: the legal niceties vanished and even the personalities of defendants were obscured. For Indians it was not only illegal but a slur on Indian nationalism; the victors were disposing of the vanquished in the very place where the latter had planned to hold their victory parade.

Besides, the three accused Shah Nawaz was a Muslim, Sahgal a Hindu and Dhillon a Sikh-represented all the major communities of India. Auchinleck may have hoped that would stress the communal nature of Indian politics-always Britain's strongest point; but for Indians it demonstrated that the I.N.A. was indeed a national army that Bose had indeed succeeded in getting Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs to unite for a common cause.

BRITISH COMMUTE SENTENCE TO AVOID MUTINY IN THE BRITISH INDIAN ARMY

The defence based its argument on the host of precedents, old and new, which supported the right of subject countries to fight for their freedom. But, for all Desai's eloquence, as far as the court-martial was concerned he was arguing a lost cause-one they were incapable of appreciating, let alone accepting.

The predictable verdict was that all three of officers were guilty of waging war against the King. Dhillon and Salgal were acquitted of the charge of murder and abetment of murder; Shah Nawaz was found guilty of abetting murder. All three were sentenced to transportation for life, cashiering and forfeiture of arrears of pay and allowances.

However, the British military authorities had become painfully aware of the consequences of the trial. Even before it had opened, I. N. A. days had been organised in various parts of the country. The day the proceedings got under way the police had to open

fire on a protesting crowd at Madura in south India. Then, as the trial proceeded, the Red Fort itself was besieged; more than a hundred were killed or injured by police firing. Between 21 and 26 November Calcutta was strike-bound. In a rare gesture of communal amity, Hindus and Muslims-their trucks flying both Congress and Muslim League flags—jointly took over the city, attacking American and British military establishments and shouting the slogans of freedom and nationalism coined by Bose. Some forty-nine military vehicles were destroyed and ninety-seven damaged, and about 200 military personnel injured: thirty-two Indians lost their lives and 200 were wounded. The violence soon spread along the Gangetic plain to Patna, Allahabad and Benares, and eventually places as far apart as Karachi and Bombay were affected.

Claude Auchinleck was no longer the confident Commander-in-Chief who had ordered the trial, and even as it was proceeding he wrote to the Viceroy expressing his doubts:

> *"I know from my long experience of Indian troops how hard it is even for the best and most sympathetic British officer to gauge the inner feelings of the Indian soldier, and history supports me in this view. I do not think any senior British officer today knows what is the real feeling among the Indian ranks regarding the 'INA'. I myself feel, from my own instinct largely, but also from the information I have had from various sources, that there is a growing feeling of sympathy for the 'INA' and an increasing tendency to disregard the brutalities committed by some of its members as well as the forswearing by all of them of their original allegiance. It is impossible to apply our standards of ethics to this problem or to shape our policy as we would, had the 'I N A' been of our own race.*

Not wishing to be caught napping again, Auchinleck set up a special organisation in his military headquarters 'to find out the real feelings of Indian ranks on this subject'. He also decided that no more I.N.A. personnel would be tried on the major charge of waging war against the King, and that only those who had committed 'acts of gross brutality' would be brought before the courts-at most between twenty and fifty men. Later Mason, joint secretary in the War Department of the government of India,

declared that the I.N.A.'s 'patriotic motive would be taken at its face value and its members would be treated as though prisoners of war'. A week before the trial ended the Viceroy empowered Auchinleck to commute sentences of death or transportation for life, and when, as required, Auchinleck came to confirm the sentences of the three men, he only agreed to the verdict of cashiering and forfeiture of pay: the transportation decision was quashed and, taking into account 'the prevailing circumstances', the men were set free.

I.N.A. Accused Released & Welcomed as Heroes

Shah Nawaz, Sahgal and Dhillon were welcomed like the heroes of a conquering army and their tales were carried back to the remotest villages of India to be told, retold and eventually mythologised. For a time the I.N.A. seemed to have become India-even for Gandhi. Now, in his weekly Harijan column, he invariably referred to Bose as 'Netaji', and conceded that 'the hypnotism of the INA has cast its spell upon us. Netaji's name is one to conjure with. His patriotism is second to none (I use the present tense intentionally). His bravery shines through all his actions.'

He, too, believed Netaji was alive. The British, however, continued with the selective trials, and on 4 February 1946 Captain Abdul Rashid was sentenced to seven years, imprisonment for certain acts of brutality. Rashid was a Muslim, and now the Muslim League came into the picture. For four days between 11 and 14 February the streets of Calcutta Bombay and Delhi witnessed unique political demonstrations in which Hindus and Muslims forgot their differences and came together to fight the I.N.A.'s battles. Four days of strict martial law were required to bring Calcutta back to normal; by then nearly fifty were dead and over five hundred injured.

In January, too, some 5,200 Royal Indian Air Force personnel had gone on strike to protest over their conditions and as an expression of sympathy for the I.N.A. cause. And on 18 February a revolt began on HMS Talwar, a training ship of the Indian navy moored off Bombay. By nightfall on the 20th virtually the whole of the Royal Indian Navy was in open rebellion: seventy eight ships in the various ports of India—Bombay, Karachi, Madras, Vizagapatanan, Calcutta and Cochin, and even in the Andamans-and nearly all the shore establishments had hauled down the Union Jack. Only ten ships and two shore establishments still remained with the British.

Other units of the armed forces were quickly affected. Between 22 and 25 February the R. I. A. F. in Bombay and Madras went on strike and on the 27th Indian soldiers in Jabalpur followed. In Bombay and Karachi, the main naval centres, ratings were able to generate impressive mass support. In Karachi gun battles had ensued which continued for two days before heavy British reinforcements finally defeated the men. In Bombay there had been what even the British owned Times of India was forced to call 'mass uprising. .. in sympathy with the naval mutiny. .. unparalleled in the city's history'.

The communists and the Congress Left had called for sympathy strikes and over 600,000 workers from the textile mills of Bombay had responded. For almost three days they had fought running, unequal battles with British troops in the streets and lanes of Bombay. The British had tanks and machine-guns, the workers had improvised weapons and even at times stones from dug-up roads. But for a few days some of Bombay's teeming working class slums had become 'no-go areas', and the British had to call in white troops to quell the uprising. In the end 270 had died and 1,300 had been injured (the government's official figures were lower: 187 and 1,002).

Attlee quick to understand implications & negotiate 'independence'...

Undoubtedly a revolutionary situation had been created. But now, suddenly, the ratings found there were no leaders. They knew their navy but they had been horribly wrong about the Indian political parties. The naval ratings had virtually given the politicians a whole unit of the British Indian armed forces; they had even started calling it the Indian National Navy. For the politicians, however, this was too alarming a prospect.

Jinnah advised the men to go back and assured them that, if they did so, he would use constitutional means to remedy their complaints of bad food and service conditions. The Congress

leaders were plainly frightened by the prospect of leading a revolution; Nehru came to Bombay and deplored the revolt. And as the ratings wondered what might have happened if there had been a leader prepared to lead them-Bose perhaps-the British re-took their ships. But if the Indian politicians had no use for revolutionary situations, the Labour government had been quick to understand the implications.

On 4 December 1945 Herbert Morrison announced in the House of Commons that a ten-member parliamentary delegation would visit India to study the situation. The five-week visit took place in January and February 1946 and by the end of it nearly all the visiting MPs were convinced that India was in a dangerous state. The February disturbances convinced Attlee that the imperial tide had at last ebbed. India could be held by force of arms for a few years more, but the cost for a Britain devastated by war would be too high.

The British government announced in February 1946 that a Cabinet mission of three ministers would visit India. That mission, in fact, failed in its purpose, the situation required another intervention by Attlee; it was his speech in the House of Commons on 20 February 1947-when he pledged the British government to transfer power to Indian hands, if necessary as two separate nations, 'not later than June 1948'-that finally led to the emergence of the two nations of India and Pakistan on 15 August 1947.

That such a situation existed in 1945 owed a great deal to Subhash Bose. He did not precisely visualise the extent of the post war turmoil; his wildest dreams could not have matched the fervour the I.N.A. trials produced. But he had told his men in Burma to fraternise with the Indians in the British Indian Army, and till the end he was confident that if Indians kept up their resolve, Britain-in an increasingly hostile postwar world-would have to concede independence. True, his army did not parade as victors in the Red Fort; but their trial as vanquished had proved that his belief in a revolutionary consciousness that was grounded in a deeper understanding of the Indian people than his enemies credited him with, or even his most fervent friends believed in.

The vision had been genuine: he just did not have the means, while alive, to translate it into a reality. Even Dilip, so sceptical

of worldly struggles, recognised that the romance of Subhas' army had finally breached the dyke that separated Indians from the other army maintained to enslave them.

Through 1946 and 1947, as Indian leaders bartered with the British and among themselves to produce a divided India, they appeared to be constantly looking over their shoulders to reassure themselves that Bose's ghost was not like Hamlet's father, turning into flesh and blood. The years of struggle had wearied them, they did not have the stomach for another fight and they were relieved to get what crumbs they could from the imperial table. When the Congress finally accepted the partition plan Nehru had only this consolation to offer for the sudden abandonment of a lifetime's principles:

> *"But of one thing I am convinced, that ultimately there will be a united and strong India. We have often to go through the valley of the shadow before we reach the sunlit mountain-tops."*

It was poor comfort for the holocaust that partition produced, and even today, for many Indians, the sunlit mountain-tops are still obscured by the shadows.

Had Bose returned to India....

> *Had Bose returned to India after the war he might well have prevented the tragedy. He was not a tired politician ready to accept office under any terms. Although his uncompromising hostility to Jinnah and Pakistan might have led to a civil war, the cost of that could not have been greater than the senseless waste of partition.*

Certainly Bose's often repeated warning that the Congress would pay dearly for the acceptance of 'office mentality' was historically acute. It came when in the late thirties the Congress was struggling to cope with the consequences of the 1935 Government of India Act, and the blandishments it offered. In the 1936 elections, the Congress reaped the rewards of nearly two decades of unceasing mass struggle against the British and totally vanquished the Muslim League.

But by 1945, after a decade of negotiations and some power-sharing with the British, the Congress was reduced to the level of the Muslim League; just another group, albeit powerful, seeking

the rewards of office. And by placing such faith in the negotiating chamber the Congress had played into the hands of Jinnah, the master lawyer and negotiator. As Bose had foreseen, the Congress had thrown away the trump card of its power-mass struggle-for the dubious delights of the round table.

But could Indians have lived with Bose? An extreme man, he produced extreme reactions: total adulation or permanent rejection. Certainly the India of Bose would have been very different from the India of Nehru. Bose had often said that India needed at least twenty years of iron dictatorial rule, and he would most certainly have rejected the type of parliamentary democracy that has developed. This opens up the whole question of whether it is better for people to have food or to have freedom to change their political rulers every five years. The argument can never be resolved-though, given the recent adulation of the West for China, some of the oldest democracies in the world seem to think food is more important.

Surely Bose's rule would have degenerated into autocracy, like that of Mrs. Gandhi between 1975 and 1977? Though the analogy is not quite accurate (Mrs. Gandhi's rule degenerated long before the events of June 1975), for conclusive evidence Bose's critics point to his behaviour in Germany and with the Japanese during the war. In a climate that brooked no dissent and where the leader was always right, he too came to believe that he could do no wrong.

Part of the possible reason for this change of personality-if there was a change-may lie in the fact that at that stage, particularly in southeast Asia, he found himself a king without any worthwhile courtiers. The people who surrounded him there were political innocents, thrust into the wider world by events beyond their control: they could only applaud, never interject. Bose was, as the official Japanese history puts it, 'a bright morning star amidst them'. There is also evidence to suggest that Subhash Bose was not quite the dictator a simple reading of his speeches makes him out to be.

No doubt there was an authoritarian streak in him, but his actions often belied his dictatorial postures in 1939, as Congress president, he behaved-against Gandhi's wishes-less like an autocrat

and more like a negotiator who had won one round and expected to reap some benefit from it. Throughout his political career he was always loyal to colleagues even at the risk of damaging his own chances: hardly the mark of a man of iron.

Almost alone among Indian leaders, Bose offered solutions that were both visionary and practical. Nehru's socialism may have been more rounded; rigorously logical and free of Bose's celebrated eclecticism. But its strain of romanticism divorced it from the realities of India, and the Nehru years resulted, almost inevitably, in a country with the most progressive socialist legislation outside the Soviet bloc which happily allowed the most unbridled capitalism to grow and flourish on a feudal structure that had changed little, if at all, since the British days. The cynicism this produced has bitten so deep that every government since has had to struggle against it and no combination in Indian politics looks likely to counteract the years of wasted opportunities and lost hopes.

This may seem hard, given the undoubted economic progress India has made in the last thirty years. When the British left, India had little or no industrial capacity; now she is the tenth industrial power in the world, exporting machinery to the West and capable of producing her own nuclear weapons. But the rapid industrialisation has been uneven and ill-directed, with the beneficiaries limited to a small, if growing, sector of the country.

Bose had the capacity to inspire total love and dedication, and produce gold from dross. He was hated by many, but those he 'touched' loved him with an almost overpowering sense of completeness. And this, combined with his rigorous, matter-of-fact manner and an instinctive feel for ancient Indian loyalties, might well have produced the revolution that India needed-and still lacks. The ideological development that Bose sought has never materialised...

Like Turkey's Kemal Ataturk-a man he admired-Bose might well have produced a nation at once new, yet full of old virtues. This is best illustrated in his approach to women: he was not one for making strident feminist statements but, even on that submarine bringing him from Germany to Japan, he was busily telling Abid Hasan of the need to get Indian women to join the I.N.A., and

how they would have to abandon their beloved sarees in order to do so. In south Asia he did get many immigrant women to join the I.N.A.-demonstrating that Indian feminism could be happily blended with the exigency of war.

The ideological development that Bose sought has never materialised. Like all national-liberation movements, the independent Congress was a coalition: of business seeking to oust British capital, of rural kulaks confident that native rulers would do more for them than alien ones, of various interest groups and of socialists aware that the Congress was the only party capable of furthering their ideas. Gandhi did suggest that the Congress should disband after independence, but this was clearly impossible: self-interest, if nothing else, ruled it out. Today almost all the major political groups in India-communists, socialists, free-enterprise capitalists, Gandhian socialists-trace their ancestry to the Congress: only the right-wing Hindu Jan Sangh can claim a different parentage. The absence of ideological development has meant the politics of banter, with interest groups perpetually feuding amongst themselves, extraordinary alliances-as between Marxists and religious obscurantists-and, above all, comical political defections. Once, in a northern state, a single individual's change of support from Congress to opposition parties led to the fall of two state governments in a single day.

The most valid criticism of Bose is related to the nature of the nationalist movement itself. For Bose's faults-and there were many-were inevitable in a nationalist fighting a colonial-imperial power that both fanned nationalism, and denied it legitimate expression. The Raj, as Marx penetratingly observed, did unwittingly bring modern ideas into India-but the nationalist reaction it produced in India was distorted by the British presence. Pre-British India was seen as a land of milk and honey in which there had been no problems, no caste system and no evils, only Indian harmony and peace. And it is a measure of the failure of Indian nationalism that what in most countries would be dismissed as delicious nonsense is still taken seriously. Today P.N. Oak, ADC to Major-General Bhonsle of the I.N.A., can claim respectable reviews in Indian papers by writing books asserting that 5,000 years ago India had an empire which included Britain. If the world has not

appreciated this, it is, argues Oak, because the relevant chapters of world history have been 'lost'. Bose was aware of India's ills, but he often came close to endorsing the delicious nonsense of pre-British bliss, if only for rhetorical purposes.

Though he bravely maintained his independence from both the Germans and the Japanese-no mean feat-he deliberately avoided the wider implications of their awful philosophies. However, his argument that foreign help was required in order to drive the British out was justified by the events of 1945-6, and has been the bedrock of nearly all successful national-liberation movements since the war. In this, at least, Bose was probably far ahead of his time. In our age, when a national-liberation movement's accepting foreign help from all and sundry is a common fact of life, the idea may seem of no great significance. In the early forties, for a subject non-white race even to think of any such thing was revolutionary indeed.

> *....'It is our duty,' Bose told his I.N.A., 'to pay for our liberty with our own blood. The freedom that we shall win through our sacrifice and exertions, we shall be able to preserve with our own strength.' ....."*
>
> *Subhash Chandra Bose, the Indian National Army, and the War of India's Liberation- Ranjan Borra, Journal of Historical Review, no. 3, 4 (Winter 1982)*

"The arrival of Subhash Chandra Bose in Germany in 1941 (during the turbulent period of World War II) and his anti-British activities in that country in cooperation with the German government, culminated in the formation of an Indian legion. This marks perhaps the most significant event in the annals of India's fight for independence. This event not only can be regarded as a historical link-up with what Bose himself chose to describe as "The Great Revolution of 1857," and which (in his words) "has been incorrectly called by English historians 'the Sepoy Mutiny,' but which is regarded by the Indian people as the First War of Independence." It also represents the historical fact that, by that time persuasive methods conducted through a nonviolent struggle under the leadership of Gandhi, had failed. An armed assault on the citadel of the British Empire in India was the only alternative left to deliver the country from bondage.

While other leaders of the Indian National Congress fell short of realizing this fact and thus betrayed a lack of pragmatic approach to the turn of world events that provided India with a golden opportunity to strike at the British by a force of arms, Bose rose to the needs of the hour and was quick to seize that opportunity.

While Bose's compatriots in India remained totally wedded to an ideological creed (nonviolence), which at that time could only serve the British and postpone the advent of independence, and while their ideological interpretations of the new revolutionary regimes in Europe-again largely influenced by British propaganda-prevented them from even harboring any thought of seeking their alliance and cooperation in the struggle against a common enemy, Subhash Chandra Bose alone had the courage to take the great plunge, thus risking his own life and reputation, solely in the interest and cause of his country. In January 1941, while under both house arrest, and strict British surveillance, he escaped.

After an arduous trek through the rugged terrains of several countries, with an Italian passport under the assumed name of Orlando Mazzota-(in which he was aided by underground revolutionaries and foreign diplomatic agents)—Bose appeared in Berlin, via Moscow, on 28 March 1941. Bose was welcome in Germany, although the news of his arrival there was kept a secret for some time for political reasons. The German Foreign Office, which was assigned the primary responsibility of dealing with Bose and taking care of him, had been well informed of the background and political status of the Indian leader through its pre-war Consulate-General at Calcutta and also by its representative in Kabul. Bose himself, naturally some what impatient for getting into action soon after his arrival in Berlin, submitted a memorandum to the German government on 9 April 1941 which outlined a plan for cooperation between the Axis powers and India.

Among other things, it called for the setting up of a "Free India Government" in Europe, preferably in Berlin; establishment of a Free India broadcasting station calling upon the Indian people to assert their independence and rise up in revolt against the British authorities; underground work in Afghanistan (Kabul) involving independent tribal territories lying between Afghanistan and India and within India itself for fostering and aiding the revolution; provision of finances by Germany in the form of a loan to the Free India government-in-exile; and deployment of German military contingents to smash the British army in India.

In a supplementary memorandum bearing the same date, Bose requested that an early pronouncement be made regarding the freedom of India and the Arab countries. It is significant to note that the memorandum did not mention the need for formation of an Indian legion. Evidently the idea of recruiting the Indian prisoners of war for the purpose of establishing a nucleus of an Indian national army did not occur to him during his early days in Berlin. At that time the German government was in the process of formulating its own plan for dealing with Subhash Chandra Bose in the best possible manner. The Foreign Office felt itself inadequate to discharge this awesome responsibility without referring the whole matter to Hitler. While this issue was being considered at the highest level of the government, Bose's own requests as set forth in the submitted memorandum, made it far too complicated and involved to be resolved at an early date.

There was a long wait for Bose, during which period he often tended to become frustrated. Nevertheless, through several sympathetic officers of the Foreign Office, he continued to press his requests and put forth new ideas. Finally, after months of waiting and many moments of disappointment often bordering on despair for Bose, Germany agreed to give him unconditional and all-out help. The two immediate results of this decision were the establishment of a Free India Center and inauguration of a Free India Radio, both beginning their operations in November 1941. These two organizations played vital and significant roles in projecting Bose's increasing activities in Germany, but a detailed account of their operation lies outside the purview of this paper. It should suffice to say that the German government put at Bose's disposal adequate funds to run these two organizations, and he was allowed complete freedom to run them the way he liked at his own discretion. In its first official meeting on 2 November 1941, the Free India Center adopted four historical resolutions that would serve as guidelines for the entire movement in subsequent months and years in Europe and Asia.

First, Jai Hind or Victory to India, would be the official form of salutation; secondly, Nobel laureate poet Rabindranath Tagore's famous patriotic song Jana Gana Mona was to be the national anthem for the free India Bose was fighting for; thirdly, in a multilingual state like India, the most widely-spoken language, Hindustani, was to be the national language; and fourthly, Subhash Chandra Bose would hereafter be known and addressed as Netaji, the Indian equivalent of the "leader" or the "Führer." In November 1941, Azad Hind Radio (or the Free India Radio) opened its programme with an announcing speech by Netaji himself, which, in fact, was a disclosure of his identity that had been kept officially secret for so long. The radio programmes were broadcast in several Indian languages on a regular basis. During this long period of "hibernation," the period between Netaji's arrival in Berlin and the beginning of operations of the two organizations, it can be reasonably assumed that the idea of forming an Indian legion that could be developed into an Indian Army of Liberation in the West, crossed Bose's mind.

He might even have discussed this matter with his colleagues-the Indian compatriots in Germany who had joined him-as to how best to implement the idea. However, as mentioned earlier, his first memorandum submitted to the German Government did not include any such plan. According to N.G. Ganpuley, who was his associate in Berlin, Netaji himself, when he left India, could not have, by any stretch of imagination, thought of forming a national army unit outside the country, and therefore he had no definite plans chalked out for its realization. Even while in Berlin, he could not think of it during the first few months of his stay there. When and how, therefore, did he come to conceive such a plan? Mr. Ganpuley relates an interesting episode in this regard. To quote again from his book:

> *It was all due to a brain wave of Netaji which started working by a simple incident. He read one day about some half a dozen Indian prisoners-of-war who were brought to Berlin by the Radio Department to listen to the BBC and other stations which sent out their programmes in Hindustani. He saw them there going about, not as free Indians, but as prisoners-of-war. They were brought to the Radio Office every day to listen to and translate the Hindustani programmes, and were sent back to their quarters escorted by a sentry ... After he had a talk with them about war, about their captivity and their present life, his active mind started working... He pondered over it for some time and decided to form a small national military unit ... No sooner was this decision taken by him ... he started negotiating with that section of the German Foreign Office with which he was in constant touch. He put before them his plans for training Indian youths from the prisoners' camps for a national militia.*

Although somewhat skeptical and hesitant at the beginning, the German response to the plans was encouraging. It was a time psychologically well-chosen by Netaji. The allied forces had been defeated on the Continent, and the Wehrmacht was marching ahead successfully in the Soviet Union. It was also a historical coincidence that a large number of British Indian prisoners-of war, captured during Rommel's blitzkrieg in North Africa, lay in German hands. Netaji's first idea was to form small parachute parties to spread propaganda in, and transmit intelligence from, the North-West Frontier in India. The reaction of some selected prisoners who were brought to Berlin from the camp of Lamsdorf in Germany and Cyrenaica was so encouraging that he asked for all Indian prisoners held in North Africa to be brought over to Germany at once. The Germans complied with this request, and the prisoners began to be concentrated at Annaburg camp near Dresden. The recruitment efforts, however, at the onset met with some opposition from the prisoners, who evidently had misgivings about Netaji's intentions and motivations. In this regard Hugh Toye writes:

> *When Bose himself visited the camp in December there was still marked hostility. His speech was interrupted, and much of what he had to say went unheard. But private interviews were more encouraging; the men's questions showed interest-what rank would they receive? What credit would be given for Indian Army seniority? How would the Legionary stand in relation to the German soldier? Bose refused to bargain, and some who might have been influential recruits were turned away. On the other hand, many of the men paid him homage as a distinguished Indian, several professed themselves ready to join the Legion unconditionally.*

Netaji sought and got agreement from the Germans that the Wehrmacht would train the Indians in the strictest military discipline, and they were to be trained in all branches of infantry in using weapons and motorized units the same way a German formation is trained; the Indian legionaries were not to be mixed up with any of the German formations; that they were not to be sent to any front other than in India for fighting against the British, but would be allowed to fight in self defense at any other place if surprised by any enemy formation; that in all other respects the Legion members would enjoy the same facilities and amenities regarding pay, clothing, food, leave, etc., as a German unit.

By December 1941 all arrangements were complete and the next important task was to persuade men to come forward and form the nucleus. It appeared that the POWs needed to be convinced that there were civilian Indian youth as well, studying, well placed in life and responsible to their families at home, who were ready to give up everything to join the Legion. Ten of the forty young Indians then residing in Berlin, came forward. They were quickly joined by five POWs who were already in Berlin in connection with the German radio propaganda, and the first group of fifteen people was thus formed. On 25 December 1941 a meeting of Indian residents in Berlin was called in the office of the Free India Center, to give a send-off to the first fifteen who were to leave the following day for Frankenburg, the first training camp and headquarters for the Legion. The brief ceremony was simple and solemn. Netaji blessed the Legion, the first of its kind in the history of the struggle for Indian independence. He christened it Azad Hind Fauj (Indian National Army). The Indian Army of Liberation in the West thus had a humble and modest birth.

The strength of the Legion grew steadily, as the task of recruitment continued unabated. Once trained to a certain level and discipline, the members of the first batch were assigned the additional responsibility of visiting the Annaberg camp and aiding in the recruitment process. While the Legion was sent to Frankenburg in Saxony, another group was taken to Meseritz in Brandenburg to be trained in tactical warfare. Abid Hasan and N.G. Swamy, the two original recruiters whom Netaji had sent to the Annaberg camp in 1941, had become de-facto

foundermembers of the Legion at Frankenburg and the irregular Company at Meseritz respectively. At Meseritz, the Indians were placed under the command of Hauptmarm Harbig, whose first object was to make them forget that they had been prisoners. There were Tajiks, Uzbeks and Persians as well under training for operational roles similar to that envisaged for the Indians.

In due course the trainees went on to tactical operational training, such as wireless operating, demolitions and riding, and also undertook special mountain and parachute courses. According to Toye, "Morale, discipline and Indo-German relations were excellent, the German officers first-rate." Netaji visited the camps from time to time and watched progress of the trainees. Since he himself was inclined toward military training and discipline, he followed the German training methods with great interest. It is understood that while in Germany Netaji himself underwent the rigours of such training, although authoritative documents on this subject are yet to be located by this writer.

While in India, he was a member of the University Training Corps at school and commanded the volunteers at an annual session of the Indian National Congress, but he never had a formal military education prior to his arrival in Germany in 1941. As Joyce Lebra writes: "Though Bose was without any previous military experience, he got his training and discipline German-style, along with the soldiers of the Indian Legion." To him, formation of a legion was more positive, more nationalistic and more gratifying than mere radio propaganda. Unlike his ex-compatriots in the Indian National Congress, including Gandhi, Nehru and Patel, he would rather seek confrontation with the British-with an army-than to work out a compromise with them on a conference table, on the issue of India's freedom.

A firm believer in discipline and organization, nothing perhaps could be more satisfying to him than to see his men being trained by the German Command, with officers of the highest calibre. In four months, the number of trainees rose to three hundred. In another six months a further three hundred were added. By December 1942, exactly a year after the recruitment of the Legion was inaugurated, it attained the strength of four battalions. At the beginning of 1943 the Legion would be 2000 strong, well on its

way up to the culminating point of 3500 men. But let us step back to early 1942, almost a year after Netaji's arrival in Berlin. After the inauguration of the Free India Center, Free India Radio, and the sending of the first fifteen legionaries to the Frankenburg training camp, Netaji's activities in Germany began in full swing. His presence in Germany was not yet officially admitted-he was still being referred to as Signor Orlando Mazzota or His Excellency Mazzota-but he began to be known to more and more people in Berlin. Josef Goebbels wrote in his diary on 1 March:

We have succeeded in prevailing upon the Indian nationalist leader, Bose, to issue an imposing declaration of war against England. It will be published most prominently in the German press and commented upon. In that way we shall now begin our official fight on behalf of India, even though we don't as yet admit it openly.

On 14 March, he remarked of Bose, "He is an excellent worker." The fall of Singapore was a signal for Netaji to broadcast his first official speech over the Free India Radio, repeating his vow to fight British imperialism until the end. This he followed with a declaration of war against England, although at that stage such a pronouncement could only be symbolic. Netaji had not yet obtained an Axis declaration in support of the freedom of India that he pressed for in the supplement of his first memorandum to the German government. That government was of the opinion that the time was not ripe yet for such a declaration and unless a pronouncement of this nature could be supported by military action, it would not be of much value.

Meanwhile, Japan proposed a tripartite declaration on India. Encouraged by this, Bose met Mussolini in Rome on 5 May, and persuaded him to obtain such a declaration in favour of Indian independence. Mussolini telegraphed the Germans, proposing proceeding at once with the declaration. To back his new proposal Mussolini told the Germans that he had urged Bose to set up a "counter-government" and to appear more conspicuously. The German reaction, which still remained guarded, is recorded by Dr. Goebbels in his diary on 11 May:

We don't like this idea very much, since we do not think the time has yet come for such a political manoeuvre. It does appear

though that the Japanese are very eager for some such step. However, emigre governments must not live too long in a vacuum. Unless they have some actuality to support them, they only exist in the realm of theory.

Netaji apparently was of the opinion that a tripartite declaration on Indian independence, followed up by a government-in-exile, would give some credibility to his declaration of war on England, push over the brink the imminent revolution in India, and legitimize the Indian legion. However, Hitler held a different view. During an interview at the Führer's field headquarters on 29 May, he told Netaii that a well-equipped army of a few thousand could control millions of unarmed revolutionaries, and there could be no political change in India until an external power knocked at her door. Germany could not yet do this. To convince Netaji, he took him to a wall map, pointed to the German positions in Russia and to India. The immense distances were yet to be bridged before such a declaration could be made. The world would consider it premature, even coming from him, at this stage. Hitler was perhaps being realistic, but nevertheless it must have come as some sort of disappointment for Netaji.

In July 1942, the Germans suggested that a contingent of the Irregular Company be sent for front-line propaganda against Indian troops at El Alamein; but Rommel, who did not like battlefields turned into proving grounds for Foreign Office ideas, opposed the move. However, at the Lehrregiment manoeuvers in September, and on field exercises in October, the Indian performance won high praise. By January 1943, it was realized that maintenance of the irregulars as a separate entity was not of much practical use, and the ninety Indian men, (excepting four under N.G. Swamy who were being trained for work within Indiaj were absorbed into the Legion. Since the supply of recruits from the Annaburg camp was fast being depleted, it was decided to hasten the shipment of prisoners of war from Italy.

According to an agreement between Italy and Germany, all Indian POWs were to be sent directly to Germany without being held in Italian camps. But, in the meanwhile, an unforseen impediment stood in the way. A long-time Indian resident in Rome, Iqbal Shedai, formed an Indian unit under the Italians, and

began broadcasting from Rome with the aid of a few Indian prisoners. It is understood that he had conferred with Netaji a few times, but obviously had no intention of co-operating with him. From radio broadcasting, he advanced into forming an Indian military unit, although it was in clear violation of the Italo-German agreement. The unit was named the Centro Militare India, but existed only from April to November 1942.

During its brief period of existence, however, Shedai succeeded in diverting several hundred volunteers to Italian camps, who would normally have gone to Germany. In November the unit was three hundred and fifty strong, having been trained by Italian officers. On 9 November, after the Allied landing in North Africa, it was learnt that the men were being sent to fight in Libya, contrary to Shedai's promises. When they refused to go and mutinied, Shedai refused to intervene. Consequently, the Centro Militare India was disbanded. It was never revived, and thus a barrier that stood in Netaji's way toward recruitment was removed. In August 1942, the Legion was moved to Koenigsbrueck, a large military training center in Saxony. This had been a regular training ground for the German infantry and motorized units for decades. Here the first contingents paraded before Netaji's eyes in October, and the growth was rapid. However, the rapid expansion of the Legion also posed the problem of finances.

Hitherto, payment to soldiers was being made from the monthly grants to the Free India Center and its office. As the number of Legionaries grew, that source became insufficient. For this problem there could be but one solution: direct payment to the Legion by the Germans. This would mean hereafter that the Legionaries would receive promotions and precedence as soldiers of national socialist Germany, and would become, in fact, a regiment of the German army, while retaining its separate name and distinction. This was agreed upon between Netaji and the German government, necessitating the taking of a formal oath of loyalty to Adolph Hitler on the part of the Legionaries. Describing the ceremony, Hugh Toye writes:

> *Five hundred Legionaries were assembled. Their German commander, Lieutenant-Colonel Krappe, addressed them, and the oath was administered by German officers to six men at a time. All was done with solemnity, the soldiers touching their officer's sword as they spoke the German words: 'I swear by God this holy oath, that I will obey the leader of the German State and people, Adolph Hitler, as commander of the German Armed Forces, in the fight for freedom of India, in which fight the leader is Subhash Chandra Bose, and that as a brave soldier, I am willing to lay down my life for this oath.' Bose presented to the Legion its standard, a tricolor in the green, white and saffron of the Indian National Congress, superimposed with the figure of a springing tiger in place of the Congress spinning wheel. "Our names," he said, "will be written in gold letters in the history of free India; every martyr in this holy war will have a monument there." It was a brave, colorful show, and for Bose, a moment of pride and emotion. "I shall lead the army," he said, "when we march to India together." The Legionaries looked well in their new uniforms, the silken banner gleaming in their midst; their drill did them credit.*

What was Netaji's plan for leading this army to India? When the Germans launched out beyond Stalingrad into Central Asia, the Indian irregulars, trained at Messeritz, would accompany their Tajik and Uzbek counterparts along with the German Troops. After Uzbekistan and Afghanistan were reached the Indian Company would leap ahead of the German advance to disrupt the British-Indian defenses in northwestern India. Netaji spoke of dropping parachute brigades, calling on the Indian peasantry to assist them. Through radio he issued warnings to British Indian soldiers and police to the effect that unless they assisted the liberation forces they would one day have to answer to the free Indian government for their criminal support of the British. The effect of the Indian army of liberation marching into India along with the German forces would be such that the entire British Indian Army morale would collapse, coinciding with a revolutionary uprising against the British. The Legion would then be the nucleus of an expanding army of free India.

Netaji's plan, largely dependent on German Military successes in the Soviet Union, undoubtedly had a setback when the Wehrmacht was halted at Stalingrad. After the German retreat from that city, the plan for marching into India from the West had

to be abandoned. The tide of war was turning swiftly, calling for devising new strategies on the part of Netaji.

While the German army's second thrust into Russia encountered an unexpected counter-offensive at Stalingrad and thus was forced to turn back, in another part of the world the forces of another Axis partner were forging ahead, nearer and nearer to India. Japan was achieving spectacular successes in the Far East and was ready to welcome Netaji as the leader of millions of Indians who lived in the countries of East and Southeast Asia. To Netaji, the Japanese attitude was extremely encouraging. Tolo, the Prime Minister, had issued statements in the Diet about Indian freedom early in 1942, and by March there was a Japanese proposal for a tripartite declaration on India. A small band of Indian National Army legionaires had already been in existence in the Southeast under Japanese patronage, although a few of its leaders, including Mohan Singh, had fallen out with the Japanese. Netaji would have no difficulty in reorganizing and expanding this organization.

He would get the active support of millions of overseas Indians, and the many thousands of British Indian prisoners-of-war would provide him a greater opportunity for recruitment, and for thus organizing a formidable army of liberation that could immediately be deployed in forward positions as the Imperial Japanese Army kept on advancing through the steaming jungles of the Malayan peninsula and Burma. During his meeting with Hitler on 29 May, the Führer had also suggested that in view of the prevalent world situation, Netaji should shift the center of his activities from Germany to the Far East. Netaji could look back at his two years work in Germany with a sense of pride and accomplishment. Broadcasting, publications and propaganda were all extended. Azad Hind Radio had extended programmes in several languages, and reports indicated that they were being listened to with interest in target areas; Azad Hind, a bilingual journal, was being published regularly.

There were other papers for the Legion besides; the Free India Center had attained an acknowledged status in Germany. It was treated as a foreign mission, entitling its members to a higher scale of rations, and exemption from some of the Aliens' regulations. Netaji himself was given a good villa, a car and special rations

for entertainment purposes. His personal allowance amounted to about eight hundred pounds a month. The monthly grant for the Free India Center rose from 1,200 pounds in 1941 to 3,200 pounds in 1944. All these Netaji stipulated as a loan from the German government, to be returned after India gained independence with the Axis assistance. However, the turn of events now demanded his presence in a different theatre-of-war. What would happen to the Legion in Netaji's absence? It was now 3,500 strong, well trained and equipped, ready for action. Netaii consulted with his aides in Berlin. A.C.N. Nambiar, an Indian journalist who had been in Europe for some eighteen years prior to Netaji's arrival in Germany, was his right-hand man. While preparing for his journey to the Asian theatre-of-war, Netaji passed on to Nambiar his policy and instructions. As Hugh Toye writes:

> *There were plans for new branches of the Free India Center, for broadcasting, for Indians to study German police methods, and for the training of Indian seamen and airmen. As for the legion, it must be used actively as soon as possible, the German officers and NCOs must be quickly replaced by Indians, there must be no communalism. Legionaries were to be trained on all the most modern German equipment, including heavy artillery and tanks; Bose would send further instructions as opportunity offered.*

A few words must be added regarding the Indo-German cooperation and comradeship during the critical days of World War II when the Legion was formed. None could describe it better than Adalbert Seifriz, who was a German Officer in the training camp of the Legionaries. He writes:

> *Agreeing to the proposal of Bose was a magnificient concession and consideration shown to the great personality of Bose by the German Government in those critical times when all German efforts were concentrated on the war ... The mutual understanding and respect between Indians and Germans and the increasing contact between them in the interest of the common task made it possible for the Indian Legion to sustain and keep up discipline right up to the German capitulation in 1945. During the period of training and even afterwards the comradeship between Indians and Germans could not be*

destroyed ... A meeting with Subhash Bose was a special event for the German training staff.-We spent many evenings with him, discussing the future of India. He lives in the minds of the training staff members as an idealistic and fighting personality, never sparing himself in the service of his people and his country ... The most rewarding fact was the real comradeship which grew between Indians and Germans, which proved true in dangerous hours, and exists still today in numerous cases. The Indian Legion was a precious instrument in strengthening and consolidating Indo-German friendship.

A report of Hitler's visit to the Indian Legion headquarters in Dresden was given by Shantaram Vishnu Samanta (one of the Legionaries) during a press interview in India, after his release from an internment camp. According to his statement, Hitler addressed the soldiers of the Legion after Netaji had left for East Asia. He spoke in German and his speech was translated into Hindustani by an interpreter. He said:

You are fortunate having been born in a country of glorious cultural traditions and a colossal manpower. I am impressed by the burning passion with which you and your Netaji seek to liberate your country from foreign domination. Your Netaji's status is even greater than mine. While I am the leader of eighty million Germans, he is the leader of 400 million Indians. In all respects he is a greater leader and a greater general than myself. I salute him, and Germany salutes him. It is the duty of all Indians to accept him as their führer and obey him implicitly. I have no doubt that if you do this, his guidance will lead India very soon to freedom.

A statement by another soldier of the Indian Legion, who remains anonymous, has a somewhat different version. It stated that both Netaji and Hitler took a joint salute of the Indian Legion and a German infantry. In addition to comments cited earlier, Hitler was reported to have made these remarks as well:

German civilians, soldiers and free Indians! I take this opportunity to welcome your acting Führer, Herr Subhash Chandra Bose. He has come here to guide all those free Indians who love their country and are determined to free it from foreign yoke. It is too much for me to dare to give you any instructions or advice because you are sons of a free country, and you would naturally like to obey implicitly the accredited leader of your own land.

However, reports of Hitler's visit and address to the Indian Legionaries are not confirmed from any other source. Netaji would be leaving Germany on 8 February 1943. On 26 January, "Independence Day for India," there was a great party in Berlin where hundreds of guests drank his health. On 28 January, which was set aside for observance as the "Legion Day" in honour of the Indian Legion, he addressed the Legion for the last time. It is believed that his departure was kept secret from his army. So, there were no visible emotions among the men; no gesture of a farewell. The impression Netaji was leaving at the Free India Center, was that he was going on a prolonged tour. So there were no signs of any anxiety. Except for a few top-ranking German officers and his closest aides, hardly anybody was aware that within a week-and-a-half he would be embarking on the most perilous journey ever undertaken by man; a submarine voyage through mine-infested waters to the other side of the world.

In his absence, Nambiar settled down in his job as his successor and soon gained respect of the Legionaries. Two months after Netaii's departure, as a result of discussion between the German Army Command and the Free India Center, it was decided to transfer the Legion from Koenigsbrueck to a coastal region in Holland, to involve it in a practical coastal defense training. It was also in accordance with Netaji's Wishes. He had often expressed a desire to give his troops, whenever possible, some training in coastal defense. After the first battalion was given a hearty send-off, an untoward incident happened within the legion; two companies of the second battalion refused to move. It was soon found out that there were three main reasons for staging this minor rebellion.

Some Legionaries were unhappy that they were not promoted, but their names had to be put on the waiting list; some simply did not want to leave Koenigsbrueck; some were influenced by a rumor that Netaji had abandoned them and had gone off leaving them entirely in German hands, who were now going to use them in the Western Front, instead of sending them to the East to fight

for India's liberation. However, the rebellion was soon quelled after a team of NCOs visited the officials of the Free India Center in Berlin and obtained clarification regarding the rebel Legionaries' grievances. The team went back to the camp and assured the men that they were not being sent to fight a war but were there purely for practical training purposes according to Netaji's wishes; that the promotions were not being passed up, they would follow in due course; and that Netaji had not abandoned them, and they would be informed about his whereabouts and plans as soon as possible. In pursuance of military discipline, the ringleaders of this act of insubordination were sent to prison camps for a specified period. The Legion was stationed in the coastal areas of Holland for five months. Afterwards, there was a decision to move it to the coastal area of Bordeaux in France from the mouth of the Girond, opposite the fortification of Foyan to the Bay of Arcachon. The Legion was taking charge here. The stay in France was utilized to give the Legionaries a thorough training in the weaponry required for the defense of the Atlantic Wall. In the spring of 1944, the first batch of twelve Indians were promoted to officers. Field Marshal Rommel, who took charge of the Atlantic Wall, once visited the area where the Indian contingent was located. Ganpulay writes: ... after having seen the work carried out by the Indians,, he exclaimed: "I am pleasantly surprised to find that in spite of very little training in coastal defense, the work done here is fairly satisfactory." While departing, he said to the Indian soldiers: "I am glad to see you have done good work; I wish you and your leader all the good luck!"

In the spring of 1944, one company of the Legion was sent to North Italy at the request of some officers who were seeking an opportunity to confront the British forces. After the Normandy invasion by the Allied forces in June 1944, the military situation in Europe began to deteriorate. It eventually became so critical that the German High Command decided to order the Indian Legion to return to Germany. So after about ten months of stay in the coastal region of Lacanau in France, the Indian Legion started its road back. It is to be understood at this point that with the landing of the Allied troops in France and their gradual advance through the French countryside, the French Maquis (underground) guerrillas had become very active, and along with the German

troops they made the Legionaries as well the target of their attacks. After travelling a certain distance, the first battalion of the Legion was temporarily located in the area of Mansle near Poitiers, while the second and the third battalion were stationed in Angouleme and Poitiers respectively. After a rest for ten days in this region, during which period they had to ward off sporadic attacks by the French underground, the Legionaries took to the road once again. In this long march back to Germany, the Legion demonstrated exemplary courage and fortitude, and underwent rigours and hardships of battlefield with equanimity.

At this time, British propaganda was directed to these men which was full of empty promises; some material was dropped from the air, while agents infiltrated into the ranks to persuade the men to desert. The propaganda promised the would-be deserters reinstatement in the British Indian army with full retroactive pay and pension, but the British hypocrisy was once again manifest in the fact that a few of the soldiers who had fallen victim to this bait were shot later by the French publicly in a market place in Poitiers without any trial, along with some German prisoners-of-war. In following the saga of the Indian Army of Liberation in the West, one has to remember that its fate was indissolubly linked with that of the Axis powers in Europe, especially Germany. The overpowering of the new revolutionary regimes of Europe by forces representing an alliance of capitalism and Marxism was an international tragedy which engulfed the Indian Legion in Europe as well. During its retreat into Germany, it encountered the enemy forces on several occasions and fought rearguard action with British and French forces, displaying exemplary bravery. The German military training had converted the regiment not only into a highly disciplined body, but a hard-core fighting unit as well. It is indeed a historical irony that this superb force could not be utilized for the purpose and way its creator and leader, Subhash Chandra Bose, had dreamt of. Nevertheless, the 950th Indian Regiment, as the Legion was officially designated, left its footprints in the battlefields of France and Germany, as their many other gallant comrades of the German Army. In the fall of 1944 until Christmas, the Indian Legion spent its time in the quiet villages of southern Germany. Between Christmas and the New Year 1945, the unit was ordered to move

into the military camp at the garrison town of Heuberg. In the spring of 1945 the Allied forces crossed the Rhine. The Russians entered the East German provinces murdering and plundering cities, townships and villages. Heavy bomber formations began destroying German cities. Transport systems became completely disorganized and paralyzed. The end was near, and there was no point in remaining in the barracks. The Legion, therefore, left its winter quarters at Heuberg in March 1945, and headed for the Alpine passes. By that time all communications with the Free India Center in Berlin had been cut off. The Legion commanders took decisions independently.

The Legion had already reached the Alpine regions east of Bodensee. However, with the surrender of the German forces on 7 May, all hopes also ended for the Free India Army. While attempting to cross over to Switzerland, the legionaries were overwhelmed by American and French units and were made prisoners. Those who fell into the hands of the French had to suffer very cruel treatment. Several were shot, while others died in prison camps in miserable conditions. The rest were eventually handed over to the British. Although thus swept into the maelstrom of the Axis disintegration in Europe, Netaji's army of liberation in the west had carved for itself a niche in history; for, indeed, it was a nucleus which would eventually precipitate a much larger fighting force elsewhere.

Inspired by its leader, that force would march into India to set in motion a process that would eventually deliver the country from an alien bondage. One, therefore, must not regard the saga of the Indian National Army in Europe as an isolated event that ended tragically. While its dream of crossing the Caucasus along with its allies, the German Armed Forces, and entering India from the Northwest, did not materialize in reality, its extension and successor, India's army of liberation in the east, did enter the country from the opposite direction, thus fulfilling the cherished dream of Netaji and his soldiers. Not only that, as we shall see subsequently, but that army made the mightiest contribution toward finally ending an imperialist rule in India. During his interview with Netaji, Hitler had suggested to him that since it would take at least another one or two years before Germany could gain direct influence in India, and while Japan's influence, in view of its spectacular successes in Southeast Asia, could come in a few months, Bose should negotiate with the Japanese.

The Führer warned Bose against an air journey which could compel him to a forced landing in British territory. He thought Bose was too important a personality to let his life be endangered by such an experiment. Hitler suggested that he could place a German submarine at his disposal which would take him to Bangkok on a journey around the Cape of Good Hope. However, despite Hitler's suggestions, it is believed that the German Foreign Office showed some reluctance in the matter of Netaji's leaving Germany and going to Japan. Col. Yamamoto Bin, Japanese military attache in Berlin (and a good personal friend of Netaji) along with the Japanese ambassador Lieutenant-General Oshima Hiroshi, had met Netaji as early as October 1941 when the latter expressed hopes for enlisting Japanese aid in his plan for wresting Indian independence. This was the beginning of a series of such meetings. After the entry of Japan in World War II in December, Netaji was more eager to go as soon as possible to East Asia and fight beside Japan for India's liberation. He reportedly urged Oshima to use his good offices to secure his passage to Asia. It was about at this point that both Oshima and Yamamoto encountered a feeling of reluctance in the matter on the part of the German Foreign Office. They had the feeling that Germany was not to willing to let Japan lead India to independence. Bose was already a useful ally as an Indian patriot, and his propaganda broadcasts were effective in both India and Britain. The Indian Legion was already having a psychological impact in India and worrying the Allies. For these reasons, "they were guarding Bose like a tiger cub." In the meantime, Ambassador Oshima had also met with Hitler and explained Bose's plan to him. According to Japanese records.

The Führer readily agreed with Oshima that it was better for Bose to shift his activities to Southeast Asia now that his country's (Japan's) armies had overrun the area. The second problem was whether Bose would get enough support in Tokyo for his activities. On this, Oshima had contacted Tokyo many times but had not received any firm answer. Finally, Tokyo replied to Oshima that

in principle it had no objection to Bose's visit to Japan. The third problem was to provide Bose with a safe means of transport to Japan. Communication between Germany and Japan was impossible during those days. Passage by boat was ruled out; and it was decided to use a plane belonging to the Lufthansa Company to airlift Bose from Germany to Japan via the Soviet Union. Tojo (Japanese Prime Minister) objected to this on the grounds that this would amount to a breach of trust with the Soviet Union. An attempt was made by both Yamamoto and Bose to get an Italian plane, but this also did not work. Finally the choice fell on a submarine. Germany agreed to carry Bose up to a certain unknown point in the east and asked that a Japanese submarine be pressed into service thence forward. After a series of exchanges with his government, Oshima finally obtained Tokyo's approval of the plan and communicated it to Bose. Alexander Werth writes:

> *An interesting anecdote related to this historic journey may perhaps be mentioned here. Shortly before Bose's departure the Japanese Naval Command raised objections because of an internal Japanese regulation not permitting civilians to travel on a warship in wartime. When Adam von Trott (of the German Foreign Office) received this message by cable from the German Ambassador in Tokyo, he sent the following reply: "Subhash Chandra Bose is by no means a private person, but Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Liberation Army." Thus the bureaucratic interference was overcome.*

On 8 February 1943, accompanied by Keppler, Nambiar and Werth, Netaji arrived at the port of Kiel where a German submarine under the command of Werner Musenberg was waiting for him. His would-be sole companion on this perilous voyage, Abid Hasan had travelled separately to Kiel in a special compartment without knowing his destination. Only after commencement of the journey was he to be informed of the itinerary. Netaji was leaving behind his chosen 3,500 soldiers of the Indian Legion, the 950th regiment of the German Army, specially trained and equipped for the task of liberating an India held in bondage by the British. We have already followed the history and fate of the Legion. Now let us turn to the East.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anthony, J. Parel : *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, New Delhi, Vistaar, 2002.

Arabinda Poddar : *Tagore : The Political Personality*, Kolkata, Indiana, 2004.

Arun, Pseud.: *Testament of Subhas Bose*, Delhi, Rajkamal Pub., 1946.

Ashton, S.R.: *British Policy Towards the Indian States, 1905-1939*, London, Curzon, 1982.

Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam: *India Wins Freedom*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1959.

Bearce, George D.: *British Attitudes Towards India 1784-1858*, Oxford, University Press, 1961.

Bhattarcharjea, Ajit: *Countdown to Partition: The Final Days*, New Delhi, HarperCollins, 1998.

Bose, S. C., *The Indian Struggle, 1920-1942,* Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Calvocoressi, Peter, and Guy Wint: *The Total War: the Story of World War II*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972.

Charles Howard McIlwain: *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern,* N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1958.

Chatterji, Joya: *Bengal Divided: Hindu Communalism and Partition, 1932-1947*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Chaudhuri, N.C.: *Thy Hand, Great Anarch!: India 1921-1952*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1987.

Derrett, J. : *Religion, Law, and the State in India*, London, Faber, 1968.

Dixit, Prabla: *Communalism: A Struggle for Power*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1981.

Foreman-Peck J. and Millward, R: *Public and Private Ownership of British Industry 1820-1990*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.

Gandhi, P. Jegadish : *Dr. Abdul Kalam's Futuristic India*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 2006.

Ghose, S.K.: *Politics of Violence: Dawn of a Dangerous Era*, Springfield, Nataraj, 1992.

Habberton, William: *Anglo-Russian Relations Concerning Afghanistan 1837-1907*, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1937.

Hasrat, Bikrama Jit: *Anglo-Sikh Relations, 1799-1849; A Reappraisal of the Rise and Fall of the Sikhs*, Hoshiazpur, Local Stockists vv Research Institute Book Agency, 1968.

Hurewitz, Jacob C.: *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record 1535-1914*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.

Huttenback. Robert A.: *British Relations with Sind 1799-1843; An Anatomy of Imperialism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California, 1962.

Kelly, John B.: *Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Nair, A. M.: *An Indian Freedom Fighter in Japan*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1983.

Nair, Janaki: *Women and Law in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Kali, 1996.

Noorani, A.G. : *Indian Political Trials : 1775-1947*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Norris, James A.: *The First Afghan War 1838-1842*, Cambridge, University Press, 1967.

Ray, B.N. : *Gandhigiri : Satyagraha After Hundred Years*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2008.

Rosen, P.: *Societies and Military Power: India and its Armies*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1996.

Singhal, D. P.: *India and Afghanistan: 1876-1907. A Study in Diplomatic Relations*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland, 1963.

Sivaram, M.: *The Road to Delhi*, Rutland, Vt., C.E. Tuttle Co., 1967.

INDEX